



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

On the early
history of the
doctrine of the
Holy Spirit,
with ...

Henry Barclay
Swete



600099942\$

ON
THE EARLY HISTORY
OF THE
DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT,
WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE CONTROVERSIES
OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

Cambridge :
PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

ON
THE EARLY HISTORY
OF THE
DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT,
WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE CONTROVERSIES
OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

BY



H. B. SWETE, M.A.,
FELLOW AND TUTOR OF GONVILLE AND CAIUS COLLEGE.

Zōμεν Πνεύματι.

Cambridge:
DEIGHTON, BELL, AND CO.
London: GEORGE BELL AND SONS.

1873

**DEVS QVI CORDA FIDELIVM SANCTI SPIRITVS ILLVSTRATIONE
DOCVISTI : DA NOBIS IN EODEM SPIRITV RECTA SAPERE ET DE
EJVS SEMPER CONSOLATIONE GAVDERE. PER DOMINVM NOSTRV.
IN VNITATE EJVSDEM SPIRITVS.**

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	3
CHAPTER I. ANTE-NICENE TIMES	5
, II. ARIUS AND THE ARIANS	30
, III. FROM 360 TO 380	47
, IV. COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE	79

Πίστενε καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ "Ἄγιον" καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχε περὶ αὐτοῦ δόξαν ἡν παρέλαβες ἔχειν περὶ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ, καὶ μὴ κατὰ τοὺς τὰ δύσφημα περὶ αὐτοῦ διδάσκοντας. Σὺ δὲ μάνθανε ὅτι ἐν ἑστὶ τοῦτο τὸ "Ἄγιον Πνεῦμα, ἀδιαιρέτον, πολυδύναμον, πολλὰ μὲν ἐνεργοῦν αὐτὸ δὲ μὴ μεριζόμενον" τὸ γινώσκον τὰ μυστήρια, τὸ ἐρευνῶν πάντα καὶ τὰ βάθη τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν εἰδεῖ περιστερᾶς κατελθόν... τὸ καὶ νῦν κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ βαπτίσματος σφραγίζον σου τὴν ψυχήν... ὅπερ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ τῇ τῆς θεότητος δόξῃ τετίμηται.

S. CYRILL. HIEROSOL. *Catech.* iv. 16.

ON THE
EARLY HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE
OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

ἐν Τριάδι ἡ θεολογία τελεία ἐστί.

S. Athan. *Or. c. Ar.* i. 18.

IN the year 325 the First OEcumenical Council put forth a Creed which ended with a simple declaration of faith in the Holy Ghost¹. Fifty-six years afterwards, the Council of Constantinople re-issued the Creed of Nicæa with the addition of an explanatory clause which ascribes to the Spirit the same power and honour as to the Father and the Consubstantial Son².

To what causes is this expansion of the Catholic Faith to be attributed? Was it simply the logical result of the Nicene doctrine with regard to the Person of the Son? Or does it represent a true part of the original deposit, recognized as such by the Church from the beginning, but expressed for the first time in the Constantinopolitan Creed? In either case, what were the circumstances under which the Catholic Church was brought to proclaim the Deity of the Holy Ghost?

¹ καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἀγιον Πνεῦμα.

² τὸ Κύριον τὸ ζωστοὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον τὸ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν. Cf. p. 87, seq.

The following pages are an attempt to give a brief answer to these questions. Our field of enquiry will lie chiefly in the Fourth Century, especially in the period which intervened between the Councils of Nicæa and Constantinople. But in the first instance it will be necessary to trace the progress of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the theology of the Ante-Nicene Church.

CHAPTER I.

ANTE-NICENE TIMES.

“Numquid perfecte de Trinitate tractatum est, antequam oblatrarent Ariani?”

S. Augustin. *in Ps. liv.*

IN the earliest age of the Church comparatively little attention was paid to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. It was thrown into the background by the paramount importance of the doctrine of the Person of Christ. A Life had been recently lived upon earth to which the history of the world offered no parallel; and the questions which were raised by that Divine Life could not fail to arrest and almost to absorb the thought of earnest men. The mission of the Spirit had been secondary and supplementary to the mission of the Son¹; the Life of the Spirit belongs to the depths of the Christian consciousness: the world “seeth Him not neither knoweth Him,” and the Church might well be content to possess His mysterious Presence without enquiring minutely into the nature of the Gift. Thus it ought not to be matter for surprise if the Person of the Spirit entered into the speculations of heresy and into the theology of the Church less frequently

¹ S. John xvi. 14, ἐκεῖνος ἔμε δοξάσει ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἔμου λήμψεται.

6 *Early Creeds set forth the Mission of the Spirit.*

than the Person of the Son, and at a later period. In the writings of the Apostles themselves, largely as they treat of the mission of the Paraclete, there are few statements of a dogmatic character with regard to His relation to the Father and the Son. No Apostolic pen has done for the doctrine of the Holy Spirit that which S. John did for the kindred doctrine of the Person of Our Lord.

The Early Church, in her few authoritative expressions of belief in the Person of the Holy Ghost, simply echoes back the teaching of the baptismal formula. Ante-Nicene confessions and rules of faith, while they enlarge upon the mission and work of the Spirit, scarcely touch the question of His place in the Divine Trinity. Thus S. Irenæus represents the Church throughout the world as having received from the Apostles a faith "in One God the Father...and in One Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God...and in the Holy Spirit, Which through the Prophets preached the dispensations [of God] and the Advents¹." According to Tertullian the Rule of Faith requires Christians to believe that "Jesus Christ after His ascension into Heaven sent in His place the Power of the Holy Ghost, to guide believers²." Novatian, who doubtless followed the traditional teaching of the Roman Church, simply describes the Holy Spirit as the Person "olim Ecclesiæ repromissum sed statutis temporum opportuni-

¹ i. 10. τὸ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν κεκηρυχός τὰς οἰκονομίας [dispositiones Dei] καὶ τὰς ἐλεύσεις [et adventum].

² *De præscr. hæret.* 13. Creditur...Jesum Christum...in cœlos exceptum...misisse vicariam vim Sp. Sancti Qui credentes agat. (Cf. *De vel. virg.* i. ab illo Vicario Domini, Spiritu S.) Another account of the *regula fidei* in Tertullian represents the Paraclete as "sanctificatorem fidei eorum qui credunt in Patrem et Filium et Sp. S." (*adv. Prax.* ii.)

tatibus redditum¹." The Creed of the Apostolical Constitutions² professes, Βαπτίζομαι καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἀγιον, τουτέστι τὸν Παράκλητον, τὸ ἐνεργῆσαν ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἀπ' αἰῶνος ἀγίοις, υἱοτερον δὲ ἀποσταλὲν καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς κατὰ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Κ. Ι. Χ., καὶ μετὰ τοὺς ἀποστόλους δὲ πᾶσι τοῖς πιστεύοντις ἐν τῇ ἀγίᾳ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. With singular unanimity these early symbolical forms, while they enter at considerable length into the relation of the Word to the Father, approach the Person of the Spirit from an aspect almost entirely practical³.

When from symbols we turn to the liturgical language of the Ante-Nicene Church, we find the earliest doxologies and hymns bearing more distinct but yet informal witness to the Deity of the Holy Ghost. The Vesper Hymn of the Eastern Church, which was ancient in the days of S. Basil, contained then as now an act of adoration to Each Person of the Holy Trinity: ὁ μέντοι λαὸς ἀρχαίαν ἀφίσι τὴν φωνὴν καὶ οὐδεὶν πώποτε ἀσεβεῖν ἐνομίσθησαν οἱ λέγοντες, Αἴνουμεν Πατέρα καὶ Τίον καὶ Ἀγιον Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ⁴. The "Gloria Patri" which East and West still use in the daily offices can scarcely

¹ *De Trin.* 29.

² vii. 41.

³ Walch (*Bibl. Symb.* pp. 10, 11) and Hahn (*Bibl. der Symbole*, pp. 78—85) include among the early confessions Origen's somewhat ambiguous statements in the *de Princ.* i. But the questionable clauses appear to be from Origen's own pen. The Creed of S. Gregory Thaumaturgus, if genuine, seems also to fall under the head of individual rather than of symbolical teaching. That of Lucian the Martyr belongs, as a confession, to the 4th century: *infr.* p. 37. Eusebius of Cæsarea produced at Nicæa an ancient Palestinian Creed which strikes the note "Πνεῦμα Ἀγιον δληθῶς Πνεῦμα Ἀγιον," but goes no further. The Creed of the Church of Jerusalem, given by S. Cyril, has only, Καὶ εἰς ἐν Πν. Ἀγ. τὸν Παράκλητον τὸ λαλήσαν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις.

⁴ S. Basil, *de Sp.* S. 73. Routh, *Reliquiae Sacr.* iii. 516 seq.

be of less early date in some one of its forms, if not indeed in that which has long been universal¹. Consistently with the early use of such doxologies in the worship of the Church we find Christian writers of the second and third centuries fearlessly including the Holy Spirit in the praises of the Father and the Son. The *Martyrdom of S. Ignatius* ends with the full roll of the Catholic *Gloria*; “In Christ Jesus Our Lord by Whom and with Whom be glory and power to the Father with the Holy Spirit for ever². ” Early in the third century a similar doxology was adopted by Julius Africanus³: while the *Pædagogus* of S. Clement of Alexandria is crowned with the mystical but not less orthodox ascription of praise τῷ μόνῳ Πατρὶ καὶ Τίῳ, Τίῳ καὶ Πατρὶ, παιδαγωγῷ καὶ διδασκάλῳ Τίῳ σὺν καὶ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι⁴. It is precarious to appeal to the testimony of the ancient Liturgies; but we can scarcely err in supposing that the Liturgy of S. James represents the worship of the most primitive Christian antiquity in such a passage as the following: Σοὶ τὸν τρισάγιον ὅμονον ἀναπέμπομεν τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Τίῳ καὶ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι νῦν καὶ δεῖ⁵.

Thus the Catholic doctrine of the Deity of the Holy Ghost found place from the first in the life and worship of the Church; in her worship, because in her life. Yet the dogmatic expression of this truth will be sought in vain among the earliest

¹ *Infra*, p. 67.

² ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν δι’ οὐ καὶ μεθ’ οὐ τῷ Πατρὶ ηδόξεα.

³ S. Basil, *de Sp. S.* 73. Routh, *R. S.* ii. 307.

⁴ *Pæd.* iii. 12.

⁵ Cf. Neale, *Hist. East. Ch.* i. 366. On the worship of the Holy Spirit in the Early Church, see Bingham, *Antiq.* xiii. 2.

outpourings of Christian devotion¹. Until heresy attacked one by one the treasures of the traditional creed, they were held firmly indeed, yet with a scarcely conscious grasp : the faithful were content to believe and to adore.

It has been well said that every heresy, whatever its form, is in fact directed against the Holy Ghost, Who is the Spirit of truth². Yet of the earlier heretical speculations few concerned themselves immediately with His Person and relation to the Divine Essence.

Some wild fancies on this subject are attributed to the so-called “father of heresy.” Simon Magus is said to have identified the Holy Spirit sometimes with himself, sometimes with the unhappy partner of his evil life³. It is not improbable that this baptized sorcerer, half enthusiast, half impostor, represented himself as the special recipient of the Divine Spirit or even as a quasi-incarnation. One who had early claimed to be “the ‘Great Power’ of God⁴,” and whose only conception of the Gospel was doubtless that of a system which offered to bring men into the closest relation with the spiritual and supernatural world, might not have been unwilling to shape to his own purpose the Christian

¹ It can scarcely be doubtful that such expressions as σὺν τῷ ζωποιῷ σου Πνεύματι, τὸ Πν. τὸ Ἀ. τὸν Κύριον τὸ ζωπ., τὴν κοινωνίαν τοῦ προσκυνητοῦ Πν., Θεοῦ Λόγος τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Ἀ. Πν. ὁμοούσιε συναίδει σύναρχε,—are post-Nicene or even post-Constantinopolitan additions to the original liturgies.

² Cf. S. Augustine, *Serm. lxxi.*

³ S. Irenæus, i. 23. Hic a multis quasi Deus glorificatus est et docuit semetipsum esse qui...in...gentibus quasi Spiritus S. adventaverit. Cf. the treatise *Adv. omn. hæreses*, vi. 19. S. Cyril, *Catech. xvi.* On the other hand, S. Epiphanius writes (i. 2), τὴν δὲ σύζυγον πορνάδα (i. e. Helena) Πν. Ἀ. εἶναι τετόλμηκε λέγειν.

⁴ Acts viii. 10, ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ καλουμένη μεγάλη.

doctrine of an indwelling Spirit of God. But it is scarcely to be supposed that Simon had seized the idea of the Holy Spirit as a distinct Divine hypostasis.

The *Gospel of the Nazarenes* seems to have represented the Holy Spirit as an impersonal effluence from God. A fragment speaks of the *Fons omnis Spiritus Sancti* as descending on Our Lord at the Baptism and addressing Him thus: “*Fili mi in omnibus prophetis expectabam te ut venires et requiescerem in te. Tu es... filius meus primogenitus*¹. ” S. Epiphanius tells us that among the Ebionites, who regarded the Baptism as the moment in which the man Jesus became the Christ, the Son of God, there were those who taught, “*Ηλθε τὸ Πνεῦμα ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ ἐνεδύσατο αὐτὸν τὸν Ἰησοῦν καλούμενον*. The Spirit is here apparently personal, but identified with the Divine in Christ².

The Gnostic systems of the second century could scarcely have failed to avail themselves of the Christian idea of the Paraclete.

In the *Gnosis* of Valentinus a distinct place in the Pleroma is assigned to the Holy Spirit. He is produced, contemporaneously with the Æon Christ, to counteract the evils caused by the erring Sophia. According to the “*Refutation of all the heresies*,” the prolation of these new Æons was not even the immediate act of Bythos: *ἐπιπροβαλεῖν κελεύει—οὐ γὰρ αὐτός, φησι, προέβαλεν, ἀλλὰ ὁ Νοῦς καὶ ἡ Ἀλήθεια—Χριστὸν καὶ Ἀγιον Πνεῦμα*³. Similarly S. Irenæus

¹ Hilgenfeld, *Nov. Test. extr. Can.* iv. 15. Cf. Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, i. i. 193 (Clark). Neander, *Ch. Hist.* i. 484 (Bohn).

² S. Epiph. *Hær.* xxx. Dorner, *Person of Christ*, i. 435. Cf. the Elkesaiter conception of the Πν. “*Ἄγ. (Ψὲ) Λίγ.*”

³ vi. 31.

assigns the *προβολὴ* to Monogenes, the first of the Valentinian *Æons*¹. Thus S. Athanasius was justified in considering Valentinus as the forerunner of those who in the 4th century defined the Holy Spirit to be *κτίσμα κτίσματος καὶ ἔργου ἔργου*—a creature twice removed from GOD².

Valentinus is said to have died about the year 160. Nearly at the same time a movement took its rise in Asia Minor, which, though it added nothing to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, tended to bring the subject more prominently into view.

There seems to be no sufficient ground for believing that Montanus gave himself out to be the promised Paraclete, or that he drew any personal distinction between the Paraclete and the Holy Ghost. S. Augustine appears to have correctly described the creed of Montanism: “adventum Spiritus Sancti a Domino promissum in se potius quam in Apostolis... fuisse asserunt redditum³;” i. e. Montanus claimed for himself and his prophets a fuller inspiration than that which had characterized the Apostolic age. S. Epiphanius assures us that on the subject of the Holy Trinity the Cataphrygians were in full accord

¹ i. 2. 5. τὸν Μονογενῆ πᾶλιν ἐτέραν προβαλέσθαι συζυγίαν κατὰ προμήθειαν τοῦ Πατρὸς...Χριστὸν καὶ Πνεῦμα Ἀγιον. In this *συζυγία* the Πν. “Αγ.” is the female *Æon*—an idea suggested by the gender of the Heb. נָשָׁה; cf. Harvey’s *S. Irenæus*, I. pp. cxxvii. and 33: see also Tert. *adv. Valent.* xi. The purpose which this *Æon* fulfils is thus explained (*Iren.* i. 11): φησὶ προβεβλῆσθαι εἰς ἀνάκρισιν καὶ καρποφορίαν τῶν Αἰώνων, ἀδόπτως εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσιόν· δι’ οὐ τὸν Αἰώνας καρποφορεῖν τὰ φυτὰ τῆς ἀληθείας.

² *Ad Serap.* i. 527: πρῶτον μὲν οὖν τῆς ἀσεβείας ἐστὶν Οὐαλεντίνον τούτο τὸ εὑρῆμα.

³ *De Hær.* xxvi. A similar claim was afterwards made by Manes: *de Hær.* xlvi. See a remarkable passage in the *Eph. ad Rom. inchoat. Expos.* 15, where the Montanists and Manichæans are mentioned together in this connection; and cf. *de Agone Chr.* 30.

with the Church¹. Moreover the later writings of Tertullian exhibit no important change of faith². There may have been in the system a latent tendency to Sabellianism; but Montanus himself and his immediate followers were scarcely conscious of the fact³. So far as Montanism has a doctrinal aspect, it may be regarded as the first expression of a need already beginning to make itself felt—the need of a fuller recognition of the Person and work of the Holy Ghost. The Church of the second century was so deeply preoccupied with the doctrine of the Logos, that Montanism may not have been without its good effect, as helping indirectly to complete the cycle of Catholic Theology.

Towards the end of the second century a reactionary movement⁴ began which in the first instance affected only the Christology of the Church, but ultimately extended itself to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. This new school professed zeal for the fundamental truth of the Unity: “*monarchiam tenemus*” was their watchword⁵. In teaching the distinct personality of the Word the Church appeared to them to be falling back into polytheism. The earlier Monarchians were sufficiently occupied with the endeavour to neutralize this danger. So completely did Praxeas succeed in identifying the Divine Nature

¹ *Hær.* xlvi. περὶ δὲ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ Πνεύματος ὁμοφρονοῦσι τῇ ἀγίᾳ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.

² Tertullian himself claims to have become “instructior per Paracletum” (*adv. Prax.* ii.).

³ Newman, *Arians*, pp. 121, 122.

⁴ Dorner, I. ii. 17.

⁵ Tert. *adv. Prax.* iii. The Church protested against this exclusive assumption of a belief in the *μοναρχία*: S. Greg. Naz. *Orat. Theol.* III. ἡμῖν μοναρχία τὸ τιμώμενον μοναρχία δὲ οὐχ ἦν ἐν περιγράφει πρόσωπον... δᾶλλ’ ἦν φύσεως ὁμοιμία συνιστησι. Cf. S. Athan. *Or. c. Ar.* iv. § 1. μία ἀρχὴ θεότητος καὶ οὐ δύο ἀρχαὶ ὅθεν κυρίως καὶ μοναρχία ἔστιν.

of Our Lord with the Person of the Father that in the terse though perhaps somewhat rhetorical language of Tertullian, “Patrem crucifixit”—God, he taught, is a simple Unity¹: God in Christ was born and suffered: ‘Pater natus, Pater passus².’ Sabellius returned to the doctrine of the Church so far as to recognize the existence of a Trinity. Thus the Holy Spirit occupies a distinct place in the Sabellian system³. Yet in the Trinity of this more fully developed Monarchianism neither the Son nor the Spirit has a distinct personality. It appears that Sabellius compared with the Trinity in God the coexistence in man of body soul and spirit: in the sun, of light heat and form⁴. The Father, he taught, is the *σχῆμα* or *εἶδος πάσης τῆς ὑποστάσεως*, the circumference of the source of light: the Son is the *ἀκτίς*, the light sent forth into the world: the Holy Spirit the quickening, warming, fructifying power of the light-beam. The Divine Ray returned to the Fount of Light at the Ascension; the energy of the Divine Spirit, it seems to have been at least implied, was another transitory manifestation of God. Such is the inference drawn by S. Athanasius, though he does not charge the Sabellians with being conscious of the results to which their system led. Sabellius had asserted⁵ that the Father, remaining One and the Same, extends Himself into Son and

¹ *Adv. Prax.* xii. Numerus scandalizat Trinitatis quasi non conexæ in unitate simplici.

² *Adv. Prax.* ii.

³ Dorner, I. ii. pp. 45, 154, seq.

⁴ *Epiph. Hær.* lxii.

⁵ S. Athan. *Or. c. Ar.* iv. 25. μαίνεται δὲ καὶ Σαβέλλιος λέγων τὸν Πατέρα εἴναι Υἱὸν καὶ ἔμπαλιν τὸν Υἱὸν εἴναι Πατέρα ὑποστάσει μὲν ἐν ὀνόματι δὲ δύο· μαίνεται δὲ καὶ παραδείγματι χρώμενος τῇ τοῦ Πν. χάριτος. φησὶ γὰρ, ὃσπερ διαιρέσεις χαρισμάτων εἰσὶ τὸ δὲ αὐτὸν Πνεῦμα, οὗτον καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ὁ αὐτὸς μὲν ἔστι πλατύνεται δὲ εἰς Υἱὸν καὶ Πνεῦμα.

Holy Ghost: *πλατύνεται εἰς Τίον καὶ Πνεῦμα.* Now this self extension of God could only mean that the Father presented Himself under the name and character of Son or Spirit according to the necessities of successive dispensations. Consequently it would seem that the Sabellian *πρόσωπα* are terminable: *ἀνάγκη δὲ καὶ παυθήσεσθαι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Τίον καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος χρείας πληρωθείσης*¹.

While Sabellianism was preying upon the African Church, an opposite yet not wholly alien heresy sprang up in Asia under the protection of Paulus of Samosata. It is unnecessary to enter into the Christology of Paulus: and the Council of Antioch which condemned him in 269 took notice only of his errors with regard to the Person of Our Lord. There is reason however to believe that as he regarded the Logos in the light of a Divine power or virtue which penetrated the man Christ Jesus, so he resolved the Holy Ghost into an impersonal energy. Leontius of Byzantium has preserved a tradition of his teaching upon this latter subject: *ὁ δὲ Παῦλος οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν ἔλεγε Πατέρα καὶ Τίον καὶ Ἀγιον Πνεῦμα*—so far Paulus was on different ground from Sabellius—*Πνεῦμα δὲ τὴν ἐπιφοιτήσασαν χάριν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις*². The testimony of Epiphanius³ is to the same effect. Paulus taught, he says, that the Logos and the Spirit are in the Divine Being as the reason of a man resides in the man's inner nature. In other words the Samosatene consistently denied the Personality of the Holy Spirit as well as of the Divine Word.

If now from the heresies of the second and

¹ S. Athan. *I.c.* Cf. Dorner, I. ii. 159, and note 29.

² *De Sectis*, iii.

³ *Hær.* cxv.

third centuries we turn to the Church writers and teachers of the same period, what progress do we find them making toward a fuller doctrine of the Holy Spirit?

We have seen that the faith of the Church on this point was at first expressed in acts of adoration rather than in any direct statements of symbolical authority.

As a natural consequence of this absence of dogmatic Church-teaching, some laxity¹ appears in the primitive use of terms which afterwards bore a strictly defined sense. It is common, e.g. to find the titles of the Holy Ghost assigned to the Logos². The Divine Nature of Christ, especially in its pre-existent state, is repeatedly described as "the Spirit," "the Spirit of God," "the Spirit of the Creator"³. On the other hand, in the *Shepherd* of Hermas the Third Person of the Trinity appears to be once designated "Filius Dei"⁴: but the passage is obscure and exceptional. So much more prominent a place in early Christian thought was held by the idea of the Logos than by that of the Holy Spirit, that even the inspiration of

¹ See Prof. J. J. Blunt, *On the use of the Early Fathers*, pp. 408—415, particularly his remarks on Origen. Cf. Liddon, *Bampton Lect.* vii. 630 seq.

² Bull, *Def. Fid. Nicæn.* I. ii. 5.

³ Just. M. *Apol.* I. 75 B. Tert. *adv. Marc.* iii. 6. 16. v. 8. *de Orat.* i. Cf. *Apologet.* 21. [Christus] de Spiritu Spiritus et de Deo Deus. S. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* i. 6) speaks of Our Lord as Πνεῦμα σπαρκούμενον: so Ps. Clement [*Rom.*] Ep. ii. ὁ Κύριος ὃν μὲν τὸ πρώτον πνεῦμα ἐγένετο σάρξ. The name "Spirit" was often given to the Second Person in allusion to Lament. iv. 20 (LXX.) πνεῦμα προσώπου ήμῶν Χριστὸς Κύριος: cf. S. Ambrose *de Sp.* S. I. 105 "et Christus Spiritus dicitur quia Jeremias dixit, Spiritus ante faciem, &c." On the Scriptural use of πνεῦμα in reference to Christ see S. Greg. Nyss. *Or. c. Eunom.* i. 57 B, and cf. 1 Cor. xv. 45 [ἐγένετο] ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ εἰς πνεῦμα [ζωοποιῶν]. This application of the word did not escape the notice of Arius: S. Athan. *de Syn.* 15.

⁴ *Sim.* v. Cf. Dorner, I. i. p. 130, seq.

the Old Testament Prophets is sometimes attributed to the Son : as when Theophilus allowed himself to write Οὗτος οὖν [sc. ὁ Λόγος] ὁν Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ καὶ ἀρχὴ καὶ σοφία καὶ δύναμις ‘Τύπου κατήρχετο εἰς τὸν προφήτας καὶ δι’ αὐτῶν ἐλάλει¹. His meaning is probably the same as S. Peter’s, who speaks of the Prophets as taught by “the Spirit of Christ².” But the unguarded use of language so open to misconstruction shows how far the doctrine of the Holy Spirit was from claiming for itself as yet a fixed and inalienable dogmatic expression.

More important in its bearing on the history of this doctrine is the idea of a subordination in the Holy Trinity, which found place in the Church of the second and third centuries. Here we have to deal with subordinationism merely as it affects or seems to affect the *ἰσοτιμία* of the Spirit.

Even in S. Justin Martyr, as early as the middle of the second century, we already find a third place or rank—*χώρα, τάξις*—assigned to the Holy Ghost³. Once indeed Justin seems to include the created Angels in the worship of the Divine Trinity, placing them in the order of his sentence before the Spirit of GOD⁴. It can hardly be said that the attempts which have been made to escape from this difficulty are satisfactory. It may be that the Apologist was

¹ *Ad Autolyc.* ii. 23.

² Τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ, 1 S. Pet. i. 10.

³ *Apol.* i. 60. 13.

⁴ *Ib.* i. 6: ἀλλ’ ἐκείνον τε καὶ τὸν παρ’ αὐτοῦ Υἱὸν ἐλθόντα καὶ διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα καὶ τὸν τὸν ἄλλων ἐπομένων καὶ ἔξομοιουμένων ἀγαθῶν ἀγγέλων στρατόν, Πνεῦμά τε τὸ προφητικὸν σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν. The conjecture στρατῆρῶν and the constructions which would connect (1) ἡμᾶς... καὶ τὸν...στρατὸν or (2) ταῦτα καὶ τὸν...στρ., seem to be alike open to objection. See upon the whole passage Bull, *Def. Fid. Nicæn.* ii. 4. 8. Kaye, *Justin M.* p. 52. Semisch, *J. der M.* ii. 350 seq. Liddon, *Bampton Lect.* vii. p. 570, note.

at little pains to convey to his non-Christian readers an exact idea of Christian doctrine. Certainly no writer, Catholic or heretical, would have intentionally represented the Holy Spirit as *inferior* to Angels: so that the passage, if pressed against S. Justin's orthodoxy, proves too much.

Another of the Greek Apologists refutes the charge of atheism by appealing to the Church's faith in a Divine Trinity. "Who would not marvel," asks Athenagoras, "to hear men call us 'Atheists,' although we speak of God the Father and God the Son and the Holy Ghost, and set forth at once Their power in Unity, and Their distinction in order¹?" Christians know, he adds, τί τὸ Πνεῦμα, τίς ἡ τῶν τοσούτων ἐνώσις καὶ διαιρεσίς ἐνουμένων τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Παιδὸς τοῦ Πατρός². His definition of the Person of the Spirit is precarious: Πνεῦμα ἀπόρροιαν εἶναι φαμεν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀπορρέον καὶ ἐπαναφερόμενον ὡς ἀκτίνα ηλίου³. But he is free from any tendency to view the Spirit as a creature: the created ἄγγελοι καὶ λειτουργοὶ are classed in a distinct category, almost immediately after this mention of the Holy Ghost.

From the Apologists we pass to a group of anti-heretical writers belonging to the end of the Second Century and the beginning of the Third.

S. Irenæus, who as Bishop of Lyons and disciple of S. Polycarp seems to unite in his own person the traditions of East and West, whilst he links the third century to the Apostolic age, is happily more diffuse upon the doctrine of the Spirit than any previous Christian writer. He expresses himself

¹ *Legat.* x. τίς οὖν ἦν ἀπορήσαι λέγοντας Θεὸν Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν Θεὸν καὶ Πνεῦμα Ἀγιον δεικνύντας αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ ἐνώσει δύναμιν καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ τάξει διαιρεσιν ἀκούσας ἀθέους καλούμένους;

² *Ib.* xii.

³ *Ib.* x. See above, p. 13.

clearly as to the Deity of the Holy Spirit, and as clearly holds the distinction of His Person from the Father and the Son. GOD, he says, had no need of Angels or Powers to assist Him in the creation of man; “Adest enim Ei semper Verbum et Sapientia, Filius et Spiritus, per Quos et in Quibus omnia libere et sponte fecit; ad Quos et loquitur dicens, Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem Nostram¹. ” “In all and through all there is One GOD, the Father; and One Word, the Son; and One Spirit; and to all who believe in Him, one salvation². ” One passage indeed has been thought to lend some support to an advanced subordinationism. S. Irenæus speaks of GOD the Father as “ministered unto by His Offspring and His Image, i. e. by the Son and the Holy Spirit³. ” But he immediately adds, “Unto Whom all angels do service and are subject,” a sufficient proof that he did not regard either the Holy Spirit or the Son as a created nature, or as essentially distinct from GOD. The drift of his argument indeed tends the other way; for he wishes to refute the Gnostic idea that the world was created by beings less than Divine⁴. And

¹ S. Irenæus, iv. 20, § 1.

² iv. 6, § 7. In omnibus et per omnia Unus Deus Pater, et Unum Verbum Filius, et Unus Spiritus; et una salus omnibus credentibus in Eum.

³ Ministrat enim Ei ad omnia sua Progenies et Figuratio sua, id est Filius et Spiritus S., Verbum et Sapientia, Quibus serviunt et subjecti sunt omnes Angeli, iv. 7. The passage in v. 36, which Neander (*Hist. of Dogma*, i. 175) cites as teaching the subordination of the Spirit, seems to refer simply to the process by which the human soul attains to GOD: “per hujusmodi gradus proficere et per Spiritum quidem [ad] Filium per Filium autem adscendere ad Patrem.”

⁴ See Bull’s *Def. Fid. Nic.* ii. 5, § 7. On the ascription to the Son and Spirit of ministerial relations to the Father, see Newman, *Arians*, p. 171.

in another place, where the Greek original is fortunately preserved, this distinction between the Spirit of God and the Creation is expressly stated. Irenæus quotes Isai. lvii. 16¹ (LXX), and thus comments on the contrast between πνεῦμα and πνοή: τὸ Πνεῦμα ἰδίως ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ τάξας...τὴν δὲ πνοὴν κοινῶς ἐπὶ τῆς κτίσεως...ἔτερον δέ ἔστι τὸ ποιηθὲν τοῦ ποιήσαντος. ή οὖν πνοὴ πρόσκαιρος, τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ἀένναον².

In Tertullian we encounter greater laxity. But it is not difficult to discover the cause. The rising heresy of the Patripassians, though it did not originally touch upon the doctrine of the Spirit, could not but ripen eventually into the *Sabelliana confusio*. Tertullian foresaw this consequence, and in his anxiety to provide against it, he certainly allowed himself to use language which seems to imply a subordination in the Trinity of more than order and place. In one well-known passage the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son is thus expressed: "tertius est Spiritus a Deo et Filio sicut tertius a radice fructus ex frutice, et tertius a fonte rivus ex flumine, et tertius a sole apex ex radio³." Yet as if conscious of the insecurity of such partial illustrations of the mystery, he continues, "nihil tamen a matrice alienatum a qua proprietates suas dicit. Ita Trinitas per consertos et connexos gradus a Patre decurrentes et monarchiæ nihil obstrepit, et οἰκονομίας statum protegit." One can plainly see the difficulty in which Tertullian was involved. He had to keep clear of the

¹ Πνεῦμα γὰρ παρ' ἐμοῦ ἔξελεύσεται, καὶ πνοὴν πᾶσαν ἔγὼ ἐποίησα.

² v. i2.

³ *Adv. Prax.* viii. Cf. *ibid.* xxx. Spiritum S. tertium nomen divinitatis et tertium gradum majestatis.

prolation-theory of Valentinus¹ on the one hand, and of the false Monarchianism of Praxeas on the other. It was hard to steer his course in perfect safety between Scylla and Charybdis, without the guiding helm of a symbolical definition resting on the authority of the Universal Church. Yet the following words from the same treatise show how well he succeeded on the whole in preserving the balance of truth : “Quasi non sic quoque (*i.e.* on Catholic principles) Unus sit omnia dum ex Uno omnia, per substantiæ scilicet Unitatem; et nihilo minus custodiatur *oikonomias* sacramentum quæ Unitatem in Trinitatem disponit, Tres dirigens, Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum. Tres autem *non statu sed gradu, nec substantia sed forma, nec potestate sed specie, unius autem substantiae et unius status et unius potestatis*, QUIA UNUS DEUS². ”

As the heretical Monarchianism developed itself, Church-teachers laid increasing stress on the true subordination, as to order and office, of the Second and Third Persons in the Holy Trinity. The fragment “*Against the heresy of Noetus*,” which bears the name of S. Hippolytus, supplies an example³. After quoting S. John i. 1, the writer proceeds to ask whether the Father and the Word are two Gods. The answer is, No, but Two Persons; and third in the order of the *economy* is the Grace of the Holy Spirit.....
*οἰκονομίᾳ συμφωνίᾳ συνάγεται εἰς ἑνα Θεόν*⁴. εἰς

¹ With which the Church seems to have been credited by the school of Praxeas : see the opening sentences of ch. viii.

² *Adv. Prax.* ii.

³ S. Hippolyt. c. *Noet.* xiv.

⁴ *οἰκονομίᾳ συμφωνίᾳ*, Migne : Routh, *Opusc.* i. 89, conjectures *οἰκονομίᾳ συμφωνίᾳ*. See his note (from Fabr.) on *Πατήρ ἐντέλλεται* (*ibid.*). That the subjection of which Hippolytus speaks does not

γάρ ἐστιν ὁ Θεός. ὁ γάρ κελεύων, Πατήρ ὁ δὲ ὑπακούων, Τίος· τὸ δὲ συνετίζον, Ἀγιον Πνεῦμα. Then follows: "In no other way can we hold the Unity of God, except by truly believing in Father Son and Holy Ghost. The Jews glorified the Father; but were not thankful, for they knew not the Son. The Disciples knew the Son, but not in the Holy Ghost; wherefore they denied Him. Therefore the Word of the Father, knowing the *economy* and the will of the Father to be glorified in no other way but this, after He rose from the dead [commanded His disciples to baptize in the Name of the Trinity]: showing that whoever should omit any one of these Persons could not glorify God perfectly: for it is through this Trinity that the Father is glorified. The Father willed, the Son wrought, the Spirit manifested. All the Scriptures proclaim this truth."

Among the heavy charges laid against Origen by Churchmen of the fourth century, he is accused of having distinctly anticipated the heresy of the Pneumatomachi. S. Epiphanius asserts that he held the Holy Ghost to be a creature¹. S. Jerome says that he made the Spirit "tertium dignitate et honore post Patrem et Filium;" that though he had once expressed a doubt whether the Third Person of

imply inferiority of essence or power is clear from c. *Noet.* viii. ἀνάγκην ἔχει καὶ μὴ θέλων ὄμολογεῖν Πατέρα Θεὸν παντοκράτορα, καὶ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν Υἱὸν Θεοῦ θεὸν ἀνθρώπου γενόμενον, φ πάντα Πατήρ ὑπέταξε παρεκτὸς ἑαυτοῦ καὶ Πνεύματος 'Αγίου' καὶ τούτους εἶναι αὐτῶς [fors. δητῶς] τρία. Again c. xii. οὐκοῦν ἔνσταρκον Δόγμα θεωροῦμεν, Πατέρα δι' Αὐτοῦ νοοῦμεν, Υἱῷ δὲ πιστεύομεν, Πνεύματι 'Αγίῳ προσκυνοῦμεν. The treatise ends with the doxology αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἄμα Πατρὶ καὶ 'Αγίῳ Πνεύματι.

¹ *Hær.* lxiv. 8. κτιστὸν ὄριζεται. But the reason he assigns for this judgment is simply Origen's use of the term *γενητὸς Θεός* in reference to the Spirit.

the Trinity were a creature (*utrum factus sit an infectus*¹), the question had been elsewhere answered by him in the affirmative; that as he believed the Son to be inferior to the Father, so he regarded the Spirit as inferior to the Son². S. Basil, too, lends some support to the charge, representing Origen as “not altogether sound in his ideas as to the Holy Spirit³.” But he proceeds to quote passages from Origen’s writings in which express witness is borne to “the Divinity of the adorable Trinity” and “of the Holy Ghost:” his inference being that men are often compelled by the strength of the traditional faith to give the lie to their own erroneous speculations⁴. Later writers condemned Origen’s doctrine of the Holy Spirit in more unqualified terms. Thus Photius⁵, in his account of the *De Principiis*, does not scruple to say that the writer “falls into many blasphemous errors, asserting that the Son was made by the Father, and the Father by the Son.” Yet in the opening pages of that treatise, if we can trust the Latin version of Rufinus, Origen expressly teaches the Divine goodness of the Son and Holy Spirit⁶; says that he cannot find the terms *factura* and *creatura* applied to the Spirit in Holy Scripture⁷; declares that He has ever been that which

¹ “Natus an innatus” is the translation which Rufinus gives. On the forms γενητὸς, γεννητὸς, see Suicer, *Thes. Eccl.* s.v.

² *Ep. ad Avit.* [“Quid cavendum in libris περὶ ἀρχῶν.”] Cf. the *Ep. ad Pamm. et Ocean.*, which affirms of Origen, “male sensisse de Filio, pejus de Spiritu Sancto.”

³ *de Sp. S. c. 29.* ἄνδρα οὐδὲ πάνυ τι ὑγεῖς περὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος τὰς ὑπολήψεις ἐν πᾶσιν ἔχοντα.

⁴ τὸ τῆς παραδόσεως ἰσχυρὸν ἐνῆγε πολλάκις τὸν ἄνδρας καὶ τοῖς οἰκείοις ἁντιών δύγματιν ἀπιλέγειν.

⁵ *Bibliothec. Cod. viii.* πλείστα βλασφημεῖ τὸν μὲν Υἱὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς πεποιησθαι λέγων τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ὑπὸ τοῦ Υἱοῦ.

⁶ *de Princ.* i. 2.

⁷ *Ib. i. 3.*

He is now¹; represents Him as included in the Unity of the Trinity with the Father and the Son².

An important passage in Origen's commentary on S. John (i. 3) throws light on his real position with regard to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Treating of the words “πάντα δὶ' Αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο,” he raises the question whether the Holy Spirit is included among the things which were made by the Logos³. His answer is at first sight satisfactory: οἵμεῖς μέντοι γε τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις πειθόμενοι τυγχάνειν καὶ ἀγένητον μηδὲν ἔτερον τοῦ Πατρὸς εἶναι πιστεύοντες, ὡς εὐστεβέστερον καὶ ἀληθὲς προσιέμεθα τὸ πάντων διὰ τοῦ Λόγου γενομένων τὸ Ἀγιον Πνεῦμα πάντων εἶναι τιμιώτερον. But he adds almost immediately that the Spirit is dependent upon the Son, οὐ χρήζειν ἔοικε τὸ Ἀγιον Πνεῦμα, διακονοῦντος Αὐτοῦ τῇ ὑποστάσει οὐ μόνον εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἀλλὰ καὶ σοφὸν εἶναι καὶ λογικὸν καὶ δίκαιον. On the whole he seems to conclude that the Holy Spirit is inferior to Him by Whom all things were made⁴. It is impossible not to see in such a passage evidence of a dangerous approach to the system which degraded the Third Person of the Trinity to the rank of a creature. Origen's devout spirit saved

¹ *de Princ.* i. 3.

² *Ib.* i. 3.

³ *In Joann.* i. 3. ἐξεταστέον δὲ ἀληθοῦς ὅντος τοῦ ‘πάντα δὶ' Αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο’ εἰ καὶ τὸ Πν. τὸ ‘Α. δὶ' Αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο’ οἷμαι γὰρ ὅτι τῷ μὲν φάσκοντι γενητὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι...ἀναγκαῖον παραδέχασθαι ὅτι τὸ ‘Α. Π. διὰ τὸν Δ. ἐγένετο, πρεσβυτέρον παρ' Αὐτὸν τὸν Δ. τυγχάνοντος.

The words are remarkable as shewing that even in Origen's time some were to be found who reckoned the Holy Spirit among τὰ γενόμενα; unless indeed Origen's ὁ φάσκων is an imaginary objector, whose future appearance was foreseen by the acute mind of the writer.

⁴ ἐν τῶν πάντων τυγχάνοντων ὑποδεεστέρων τοῦ δὲ οὐ ἐγένετο. Huet cites S. Ath. *Or. c. Ar.* 2, where the Son is described as at once μείζων [τοῦ Πνεύματος] καὶ ἴσος—‘Major, propter dignitatem et auctoritatem originis: aequalis, essentia et natura.’ But Origen's language is scarcely satisfied by this limited inferiority.

him from this blasphemy: with a happy inconsistency he shrunk from the conclusion to which his premises would have led a less religious mind.

Amongst Origen's successors in the catechetical chair of Alexandria the name of Dionysius is pre-eminent. Like his master, Dionysius labours under the imputation of having held unsound language on the Person of the Holy Spirit, "degrading Him," according to S. Basil, "from the Divine nature, and setting Him down among created and ministering spirits¹." Nevertheless, to S. Basil's surprise², the great Alexandrian's letter to his Roman namesake ended with the orthodox ascription τῷ Θεῷ Πατρὶ καὶ Τίῳ σὺν τῷ Ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι δόξα καὶ κράτος. The fact seems to show that his doctrine of the Holy Spirit had been misinterpreted. Possibly he had been betrayed into subordinationist expressions by his attachment to Origen or by his own position of antagonism to Sabellian teaching. But a writer radically unsound could scarcely have used the words attributed to Dionysius by S. Athanasius³: οὗτω μὲν ἡμεῖς εἰς τὴν Τριάδα τὴν Μονάδα πλατύνομεν ἀδιαιρετον, καὶ τὴν Τριάδα πάλιν εἰς τὴν Μονάδα συγκεφαλαιούμεθα. He had written just before, "Each of the Names is inseparable from That which precedes it. I speak of the Father, and before the Son is mentioned, He is already signified in the Father's Name ... I add the Holy Spirit, and in so doing I indicate the Persons from Whom and through Whom He comes. It is impossible to separate the Holy Ghost

¹ *Eph.* 41. πρὸς δὲ τούτους περὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἀφῆκε φωνὰς ἥκιστα πρεπούσας τῷ Πνεύματι, τῆς προσκυνουμένης αὐτὸς Θεότητος ἐξορίζων καὶ κάτω που τῇ επιστῇ καὶ λειτουργῷ φύσει συναριθμῶν.

² *De Sp.* S. 29. ὁ καὶ παράδοξον ἀκοῦσαι.

³ *De Sent. Dionysii*, 17.

either from Him by Whom He is sent, or from Him by Whom He is conveyed, in Whose hands He is¹.” Certainly S. Athanasius is right: his great predecessor in the see of Alexandria was no Arian.

A similar charge is laid against another of Origen’s successors. Pierius was Master of the school during the Episcopate of Theonas, who followed S. Dionysius. He was sound in his views of the Person of our Lord, but subordinated the Spirit both to the Father and the Son. So we learn from Photius², whose words are: *περὶ μέντοι τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐπισφαλῶς λίαν καὶ δυσσεβῶς δογματίζει· υποβεβηκέναι γὰρ Αὐτὸν τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ Τίον ἀποφάσκει δόξης.* If Photius is right—and the careful explicitness of his statement seems to prove its trustworthiness³—Pierius approached singularly near to those of the Semiarian party who holding the Deity of the Son hesitated to give the like honour to the Holy Ghost. Yet the disciple of Origen did not go the length of calling the Divine Spirit a creature, like the disciples of Arius and Macedonius. Photius says nothing of this. And Photius was not likely to have overlooked any such overt blasphemy, supposing Pierius to have been guilty of it.

One other Father of the school of Origen demands notice here: S. Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea. By S. Basil he is represented as leaning to Sabellian, rather than to subordinationist views: asserting⁴ e.g. that the Father and the Son are One in hypostasis, two in conception only. With regard to the Holy Spirit, we may assume that his belief is

¹ *ἐν τε ταῖς χεροῖν Αὐτῶν ἔστι τὸ Πνεῦμα, μήτε τοῦ πέμποντος μήτε τοῦ φέροντος δυνάμενον στέρεσθαι.*

² *Bibliothec. Cod. cxix.*

³ Cf. Routh, *R. S.* iii. 433.

⁴ *Eph. 210. Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν ἐπινοίᾳ μὲν εἶναι δύο, υποστάσει δὲ ἐν.*

correctly represented by the ἐκθεσις πίστεως which both S. Basil and S. Gregory of Nyssa ascribe to his pen¹. According to this confession there is ἐν Πνεῦμα Ἀγιον ἐκ Θεοῦ τὴν ὑπαρξιν ἔχον...εἰκὼν τοῦ Τίου τελείου τελεία, ζωὴ ζώντων αἵτια, ἀγιότης ἀγιασμοῦ χορηγός, ἐν φανεροῦται Θεὸς ὁ Πατὴρ ... καὶ Θεὸς ὁ Τίος. It is possible that the words which follow—οὐτε κτιστόν τι ή δοῦλον ἐν τῇ Τριάδι—ought to be regarded as an interpolation²: but the ζωὴ ζώντων αἵτια is probably genuine, and sufficiently near to the ζωοποιὸν of the Constantinopolitan Creed to prove that S. Gregory the Wonderworker was one in faith with his namesakes of the fourth century.

On the whole it cannot be fairly made out that Origen was what S. Jerome has not scrupled to call him³, “fons Arii,” the true author of Arianism. The school of Origen may have unconsciously prepared the ground for the seed which Arius was about to sow. But Arianism did not, in the first instance at least, claim the support of Origen; and there is reason to believe that Antioch rather than Alexandria supplied the groundwork of the new heresy: that the troubles of the fourth century are historically related to the blasphemies of Paulus of Samosata⁴ rather than to the hazardous yet not indevote speculations of the great Egyptian philosopher.

The West, true to its practical and traditional

¹ S. Basil, *Ep. 204*; S. Greg. Nyss. *Vita Greg. Thaum.* S. Gregory of Nyssa asserts that the αὐτόγραφον was preserved in the Church of Neo-Cæsarea down to his own time. Cf. Migne, *Patrol.* x. p. 965.

² Walch, *Symb.* p. 20. Yet see S. Greg. Naz. *Or. x.* οὐδὲν τῆς Τριάδος δοῦλον...ἥκουσα τῶν συφῶν τινὸς λέγοντος.

³ *Ep. ad Panim. et Ocean.*

⁴ Cf. Hefele, *Conc.-Geschichte*, i. p. 219, &c.; and Newman, *Arians*, pp. 1–9; 101.

type of Christianity, contributed little during this period to the history of the doctrine. Lactantius, indeed, if we may believe S. Jerome¹, approached to the “Jewish error” of regarding the Holy Spirit as impersonal; “in libris suis et maxime in epistolis ad Demetrianum Spiritus Sancti negat substantiam, et errore Judaico dicit Eum vel ad Patrem referri vel ad Filium et sanctificationem utriusque Personæ sub Ejus nomine demonstrari.” This view however seems to have found little favour in the Early Church, Western or Eastern; and Lactantius, if he really held it, stood almost alone. The judgment of the Western Church, in the age before the Council of Nicæa, is preserved to us in the grand words of the Roman Dionysius, who after condemning Sabellianism on the one hand and Tritheism on the other, thus enunciates the faith of Christendom on the mystery of the Holy Trinity: ήνωσθαι ἀνάγκη τῷ Θεῷ τῶν ὅλων τὸν Θεῖον Λόγον ἐμφιλοχωρεῖν δὲ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἐνδιαιτᾶσθαι δεῖ τὸ Ἀγιον Πνεῦμα· ηδη καὶ τὴν Θείαν Τριάδα εἰς ἔνα ὕσπερ εἰς κορυφήν των συγκεφαλαιούσθαι τε καὶ συνάγεσθαι πᾶσα ἀνάγκη. “Thus,” he adds, “we shall preserve the Divine Trinity and also the holy doctrine of the μοναρχία². ” It was already plain that in the Roman See the various forms of anti-Trinitarian heresy, and among them any attack which might be made upon the Deity of the Holy Spirit, would find a determined foe.

It may be well to close this chapter with a brief review of the position which the doctrine of the Holy Spirit had reached at the end of the third century.

Amongst speculators external to the Church

¹ *Ep. ad Pamm. et Ocean.* On “errore Judaico,” see Pearson, *Creed*, p. 371 *u. [=ii. 261].*

² S. Athan. *de decret. Nicen. Syn.* 26.

CHAPTER II.

ARIUS AND THE ARIANS.

ἀνάπτεται ἀπὸ σμικροῦ σπιωθῆρος μέγα πῦρ.

Socr. *H. E. i. 6.*

THE first year of the fourth century witnessed the death of Theonas and the consecration of Peter to the see of Alexandria. Among the Deacons ordained by Peter was a Libyan¹ named Arius, who in his early years had been a disciple of Lucian of Antioch².

It is to be noted that the heresy which bears the name of Arius made its first appearance in the form of a protest against doctrine which was presumed to be Sabellian. The circumstances as given by Socrates were briefly these. In the year 312 Alexander, now Bishop in the room of Achillas the successor of Peter, was discoursing one day in the presence of his Clergy on the Holy Trinity. He seems to have laid especial stress on the Unity of the Hypostases in GOD: ἐν Τριάδι Μονάδα εἶναι φιλοσοφῶν ἔθεολόγει³. Arius, who was at this time priest of one of the most important churches in Alexandria, thinking that in the Bishop's language he could recognize the Monarchianism of his fellow-

¹ S. Epiph. *Hær. Ixix.*

² He addresses Eusebius of Nicomedia as συλλογικανιστής. Cf. Hefele, *Conc.-Geschichte*, i. p. 226.

³ Socr. i. 5.

countryman Sabellius¹, met it by a counter-statement which exceeded the most advanced subordinatism of the previous century. He argued from the very name of 'Son' that the Second Person had a beginning of existence. And if He had, He must have been created out of nothing : ἐξ οὐκ ὅντων ἔχει τὴν ψόστασιν.

In this retort, no mention is made of the Person of the Holy Spirit. The doctrine of the Spirit is crowded out of view by the vast issues which were raised by Arius in his attack upon the Consubstantiality of the Son. But it is important to remember that Arianism from the first involved the denial of the eternity and uncreated nature of the Holy Ghost. It was a revolt against the proposition ἐν τριάδι μονάς. And the principle of this revolt was destructive of faith in the Deity alike of the Son and of the Spirit. If the Son were created, could the Spirit be regarded as 'uncreate'? Must not the Third Person be included in the degradation of the Second?

S. Ambrose seems to say that Arius himself at a subsequent time expressed this inference in words, and in its coarsest form². S. Damasus also condemns him together with Eunomius, as

¹ The Arians persisted in keeping up this charge of Sabellianism : "Ariani Sabellianos nos esse criminantur." S. Aug. *de Nupt.* ii. 38. Some colour was subsequently given to the charge by the position which Marcellus of Ancyra took up against the Arians, and the still more exaggerated views of his pupil Photinus. But Marcellus was abandoned by the Catholics, as soon as his heretical tendencies were ascertained : S. Basil, *Ep.* 69. And the Council of Constantinople condemned the Marcellians and Photinians equally with the Arians and Pneumatomachi. According to S. Augustine (*Serm. 71: Ep. 185*) the Photinians themselves ultimately denied by implication the Deity of the Holy Spirit.

² In *Symb. 2.* Spiritum Sanctum Filii impie asserit esse creaturam.

guilty of like impiety against the Holy Spirit¹, allowing however a verbal difference in their modes of dealing with the subject. Yet if the heresiarch or any of his immediate followers had really ventured upon this ground, it is strange that Arius does not stand charged with the offence either in the letters of Alexander, or in the records of the Council of Nicæa, or in the controversial writings of S. Athanasius. The letters of Arius himself and the fragments of his 'Thalia' bear no trace of any direct and formal denial of the Deity of the Holy Ghost. But they attack the Trinitarian position of the Church as a whole, and leave no doubt as to the course which Arianism must ultimately take when the doctrine of the Spirit came into view. Thus in his cautious and conciliatory letter to Alexander, Arius writes, "There are Three Hypostases; and God being the Cause of all things, is absolutely Alone as Unoriginate (*ἀναρχος μονώρατος*)²...God is before all things, as being a monad, and the origin of all." The 'Thalia' is more explicit³: 'there is a Trinity but not of equal glory; the Hypostases are incommunicable with each other, one being more glorious than the other to an infinite degree.' In another passage, of which S. Athanasius seems to give a paraphrase rather than the precise words, Arius maintained that the *οὐσίαι* of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are *μεμερισμέναι τῇ φύσει καὶ ἀπεξενωμέναι καὶ ἀποσχοινισμέναι καὶ ἀλλότριοι καὶ*

¹ *Eph. Synod. ad Paulin.* ap. Theod. v. 11. ἀναθεματίζομεν "Ἄρειον καὶ Εὐνόμιον οἱ τῇ ἵση δυστεβείᾳ εἰ καὶ τοῖς ρήμασι διαφέρονται τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ τὸ Ἀγιον Πνεύμα κτίσμα εἴναι διασχυρίζονται.

² The words are in themselves susceptible of an orthodox meaning; see exx. in Suicer, s.v. *ἀναρχος*.

³ S. Athan. *de Syn.* 15. *τριάς ἔστι δόξαις οὐχ ὁμοίαις· ἀνεπίμικτοι ἔσταις εἰσὶν αἱ ὑποστάσεις αὐτῶν, μία τῆς μᾶς ἐνδοξοτέρα δόξαις ἐπ' ἄπειρον.*

ἀμέτοχοι ἀλλήλων; adding (and here we have his own language) "They are altogether and infinitely dissimilar both in essence and in glory¹." By these terms the Holy Ghost is certainly excluded from the essence and glory of the Father, and even His inferiority to the Son is not obscurely indicated. Still there is no formal definition of His position in the Arian Trinity. Nor do we detect any signs of a settled doctrine upon this point in the correspondence between Arius and Eusebius of Nicomedia², or in the outspoken letter of Eusebius to Paulinus of Tyre³. A sentence, however, in the letter to Paulinus is significant, as showing the direction from which the Arian attack on the Deity of the Spirit would surely come. "All things," Eusebius writes, "were made by the Son: all things are of God." Words which from an Arian standpoint could only mean that the Father Alone is excepted from the category of created things: that all else was brought into existence by the Son, God's Perfect Creature. Another stroke of the pen would have sufficed to draw the inference, "the Holy Spirit was created by the Son, as the Son by the Father⁴."

¹ S. Athan. *Or. c. Ar.* i. 6. καὶ, ὡς αὐτὸς ἐφθέγξατο, ἀνόμοιοι πάμπαν ἀλλήλων ταῖς τε οὐσίαις καὶ δόξαις ἐπ' ἀπειρον.

² Theodoret, i. 5, S. Athan. *de Syn.* 17. Athanasius gives a list of other correspondents of Arius, who held similar language.

³ Theodoret, i. 6.

⁴ Eusebius of Cæsarea, who occupied middle ground between Arianism and the Catholic doctrine of the Son, allowed himself to write of the Holy Spirit in terms far more open to exception: *de Eccl. Theol.* (adv. Marcell.) iii. 6. ὁ δὲ Υἱὸς μόνος πατρικῆ θεότητι τετιμημένος ποιητικὸς ἀν εἴη καὶ δημιουργικὸς τῆς τῶν γενητῶν ἀπάντων... καὶ δὴ καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς τοῦ Παρακλήτου Πνεύματος ὑπάρχειν. τὸ δὲ Παράκλητον Πνεύμα οὗτε Θεός οὗτε Υἱός ἐπεὶ μὴ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὄμοιώς τῷ Υἱῷ καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν γένεσιν εἰληφεν, ἐν δέ τι τῶν διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ γενομένων τυγχάνει. The allusion is to S. John i. 3. Cf. Origen's remarks on the same text, cited above, ch. i. p. 23.

Nevertheless, whether from motives of prudence, or because they were already fully occupied with their attack upon the Deity of the Son, or, as we may prefer to believe, because the full consequences of the system were not consciously apprehended even by its originators, it seems certain that neither Arius nor his friends had written or spoken thus before the year 325. S. Basil doubtless gives the true explanation of the silence which the Nicene Council preserved upon the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. "In the Creed of Nicæa," he writes¹,

τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἀρκούντως καὶ ἀκριβῶς διώρισται,
τὰ μὲν ἐπὶ διορθώσει τῶν βλαβέντων, τὰ δὲ εἰς προφυ-
λακῆν τῶν προσδοκωμένων ὑποφυήσεσθαι· ὁ δὲ περὶ²
τοῦ Πνεύματος λόγος ἐν παραδρομῇ κεῖται, οὐδαμῶς
ἔξεργασίας ἀξιωθεὶς διὰ τὸ μηδέπω τότε τοῦτο κι-
νεῖσθαι τὸ ζήτημα² ἀλλ' ἀνεπιβούλευτον ἐνπάρχειν
ταῖς τῶν πιστεύοντων ψυχαῖς τὴν περὶ αὐτοῦ διάνοιαν.

The majority of the simple-minded Fathers of the First Ecumenical Council, better versed in the practical life of faith than in the subtleties of theological warfare, possibly did not anticipate an extension of Arian principles to the doctrine of the

¹ S. Basil, *Eph.* 78. He adds, Κατὰ μικρὸν δὲ προίοντα τὰ πονηρὰ τῆς ἀσεβείας σπέρματα ἢ πρότερον ὑπὸ Ἀρείου τοῦ προστάτου τῆς αἱρέσεως κατεβλήθη, ὃστερον δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν τὰ ἔκεινον κακῶς διαδεξαμένων ἐπὶ λύμη τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἔξεργάφη, i. e. the heresy of the Pneumatomachi existed seminally and potentially in the teaching of Arius, though its development was left to his successors.

² Cf. S. Basil, *Eph.* 387. τὸ νῦν ἀνακύψαν παρὰ τῶν ἀεὶ καινοτομεῖν ἐπι-
χειρούντων ζήτημα παραστηθὲν τοῖς πᾶσι διὰ τὸ ἀναπτύρητον ἀδιόρθω-
τον κατελείφθη—λέγω δὲ τὸ περὶ τοῦ "Α. Πνεύματος." S. Epiph. *Hær.*
lxxiv. οὐ γέγονε δὲ τότε περὶ τοῦ Πν. ἡ ζήτησις. S. Jerome, *Eph. ad
Pamm. et Ocean.* De Ario tunc, non de Origene quæstio fuit; de
Filio, non de Spiritu Sancto. Confessi sunt quod negabatur, tacu-
erunt de quo nemo quærebatur. S. Gregory Naz. (*Eph.* ii. *ad Cledon.*) writes to the same effect. S. Augustine says that Donatus was sus-
pected of Anomœan error with regard to both the Son and the Holy
Ghost. But it was overlooked in the stir which was caused by his
schism. Aug. *de Hær.* lxxix.

Spirit. They were content to reiterate the old faith in the Holy Ghost, which indeed virtually confessed, though it did not proclaim, His Consubstantiality with the Father and the Son¹. But to some at least of the more practised theologians who were present at Nicæa, the sudden, solemn pause after the mention of the Holy Ghost must have seemed a prophetic warning that this ground had not yet been won by the Church, and that here must be fought the next great battle for the integrity of the Catholic Faith.

Yet nearly five-and-thirty years passed before that battle had well begun. It is strange that among the ceaseless fluctuations of belief which marked the busy years intervening between the Council of Nicæa and the Councils of Seleucia and Ariminum, the question of the Holy Spirit's Consubstantiality and *ἰσοτιμία* was never formally raised. Of more than a dozen creeds and confessions put forth during this interval, and representing the various phases of Arian doctrine, there is not one which deals with the subject in a systematic way. These symbolical documents, however, are important to our present enquiry as serving to illustrate the growth of Arianism during this period, and to prepare us for the new form of heresy with which the next stage of the controversy suddenly opens.

At the head of the Arian confessions stands one which bears the name of Arius himself². It was presented to Constantine in 328-9; and as its compilers, Arius and Euzoius, desired to re-establish themselves in the Emperor's favour, the language

¹ Cf. S. Epiph. *Hær.* lxxiv. τὸ δὲ ‘πιστεύομεν’ οὐχ ἀπλῶς εἴρηται, ἀλλ’ ἡ πίστις εἰς Θεόν. So S. Gregory of Nazianzus asks (*Or. xxxvii.*) εἰ κτίσμα τὸ Πνεῦμα πῶς εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύομεν;

² Socr. i. 26. Sozom. ii. 27.

is purposely guarded, and distinguished from that of the Catholic Church by omission rather than by any heretical statements. "We believe," they say, "in One God ... and in the Lord Jesus Christ, His Son ... and in the Holy Ghost ... If we do not thus believe, or acknowledge in truth the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as the whole Catholic Church and the Scriptures teach, God is our Judge¹." The key thus struck by their chief was more or less steadily maintained by the Arians for the next thirty years. They succeeded in concealing the ultimate issues of Arianism under language, which, while it fell short of the Nicene standard, did not launch forth into open unbelief².

Thus, in 341, the Council of Antioch, though under the influence of Eusebius of Nicomedia, and ready to confirm the unjust sentence which had deposed S. Athanasius, produced four Creeds, all fairly orthodox. Of these, the second³—best known as the Dedication Creed—speaks of the Holy Ghost as "given to believers for their consolation, sanctification and perfection⁴"; and on the subject of the Trinity declares that "the names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are not used without distinction or meaning, but exactly indicate the proper

¹ Usher (*de Symb.*, Works, vii. 310) thinks that this Confession is simply a recital of the old Creed of Alexandria. See however Walch, p. 49.

² Pusey, *Councils of the Church*, p. 119.

³ S. Athan. *de Syn.* 23. Socr. ii. 10. Cf. the Latin version given by S. Hilary, *de Syn.* 29.

⁴ τὸ εἰς παράκλησιν καὶ ἀγιασμὸν καὶ τελείωσιν τοῖς πιστεύοντις διδόμενον. Cf. the third Antiochene Creed: τὸν Παράκλητον, τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ὁ καὶ διὰ τοῦ προφήτου ἐπαγγειλατο ὁ Θεὸς ἔκχέειν κ.τ.λ. The fourth adds ὅπερ ἐπαγγειλάμενος [ὁ Κύριος] τοῖς ἀποστόλοις μετὰ τὴν εἰς οὐρανὸν αὐτὸν ἀνοδὸν ἀπέστειλε διδάξαι καὶ ὑπομνῆσαι αὐτὸν πάντα δὲ οὐ καὶ ἀγιασθήσονται αἱ τῶν εἱλικρινῶν εἰς αὐτὸν πεπιστευκότων ψυχαί.

person, rank, and glory of Each of Those who are so named; so that in personality They are Three, but in harmony One¹." As if conscious that the last sentence was ambiguous, the Council proceeds to anathematize the phraseology of Arius as unscriptural, and *on that account* deserving of condemnation². The Creed itself was attributed to the martyr Lucian³.

Next came the *Macrostich* (345)⁴. Great care and labour seem to have been spent upon this document, which was in fact an attempt to represent the Eusebian doctrine to the orthodox West, in such terms as to secure its adhesion. The relation of the Son to the Father is set forth with especial fulness. The Son is to be regarded as the Personal Word of God, God of God, begotten before the ages, although subject to God the Father, and not like the Father, Unoriginate: "nor is it safe to say that He is ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων or ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως, or to assert ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν: for all such expres-

¹ τῶν δύναμάτων οὐχ ἀπλῶς οὐδὲ ἀργῶς [non simpliciter neque otiose, *Hil.*] κειμένων ἀλλὰ σημαινόντων ἀκριβῶς τὴν οἰκείαν ἔκαστου τῶν δύναμάς ζομένων ὑπόστασιν καὶ τάξιν καὶ δόξαν ὡς εἴναι τῇ μὲν ὑποστάσει τρία τῇ δὲ συμφωνίᾳ ἔν.

² μὴ ὡς αἱ θεῖαι γραφαὶ παραδέδωκαν. They add, 'Ημεῖς γάρ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐκ τῶν θείων γραφῶν παραδεδομένοις...ἀληθινῶς τε καὶ ἐρφάθως καὶ πιστεύομεν καὶ ἀκολουθοῦμεν. This refusal to go beyond the letter of Scripture is characteristic of Arian Confessions: cf. Epiph. *Hær.* lxiii. τὸ ὄμοούσιον τέλειον ἐκβάλλουσι δῆθεν ὡς ἀλλότριον ὃν τῆς θείας γραφής. The Church on the other hand took her stand on the spirit of the Apostolic writings as interpreted by Apostolic tradition: S. Athan. *de decr. Syn. Nicæn.* i. 270 εἰ καὶ μὴ οὕτως ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς εἰσὶν αἱ λέξεις, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν διάνοιαν ἔχουσιν. Servile adherence to the letter was denounced as a mere cloke for unbelief of Catholic truth: S. Greg. Naz. *Or.* xxxi. ἔνδυμα τῆς ἀσεβείας ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς η φιλία τοῦ γράμματος. Cf. Ullmann, *Greg. v. Naz.* p. 381.

³ Sozom. iii. 5. Cf. Walch, p. 34, and *supr.* p. 7, note 3.

⁴ Athan. *de Syn.* 26; Socr. ii. 19; Niceph. ix. 11. Cf. Sozom. ii. 11.

sions are foreign to the Holy Scriptures." With regard to the Holy Ghost nothing is defined, except the nature of His temporal mission, which is set forth in the words of the 4th Antiochene Confession¹. The Macrostich disclaims Sabellianism on the one side and Tritheism on the other, and finally sets forth its Trinitarian views in the following words : " Believing in the Perfect and most Holy Trinity, *i.e.* in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost, and declaring both the Father and the Son to be God; we acknowledge nevertheless not two Gods, but One Divine Majesty...the Father Alone ruling all, even the Son Himself, and *the Son being subject to the Father, but supreme over all things which were made by Him, and according to the Father's will bestowing abundantly upon the saints the grace of the Holy Ghost*²." We seem to be on the verge of a formal definition of the Holy Spirit's place in the Trinity: but at this point the Confession suddenly breaks off.

Two years later (347), the Arian party took up a bolder attitude. Council was arrayed against council: the Eusebian camp at Philippopolis against the Catholics at Sardica. A fresh Creed was put forth³, but it proved to be little more than a collation of the 4th Antiochene with the Macrostich, and no

¹ Vid. *supr.* p. 36, note 4.

² πανταρχόντος μὲν καθόλου πάντων, καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς τοῦ δὲ Υἱοῦ ὑποτεταγμένου τῷ Πατρί ἐκτὸς δὲ αὐτοῦ πάντων μετ' αὐτὸν βασιλεύοντος τῶν ὡρ' αὐτοῦ γενομένων καὶ τὴν τοῦ 'Αγίου Πνεύματος χάριν ἀφέοντος τοῖς ἁγίοις δωρουμένου πατρικῷ βαυλήματι. The Oneness of the Father and the Son is described in the remarkable words, ὅλου μὲν τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐνεστερνισμένου τὸν Υἱὸν ὅλου δὲ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐξηργημένον καὶ προσπεφυκότος τῷ Πατρὶ. No such intimate union is said to exist between the Father and the Holy Spirit, or between the Son and the Spirit.

³ S. Hilar. *de Syn.* 34.

new light was thrown on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

Four years elapsed, and another Confession came from the restless faction, who, refusing to accept the Nicene standard, seemed to be as little satisfied with their own attempts to provide a substitute. It was the first Creed of Sirmium: two other Creeds under the same name followed in the interval between 351 and 360.

In the First Sirmian Creed (351)¹, there is distinct evidence that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit was beginning to claim a share of the attention hitherto almost exclusively given to the Person of the Son. Three anathemas are pronounced against erroneous views upon this subject. Those are to be condemned who call the Holy Ghost the "Ingenerate God," or "a part of the Father or of the Son²," or who refuse to distinguish the Person of the Paraclete from the Person of the Son². So far as it goes, the Creed is, generally speaking, orthodox: yet the following words remind us of the hint dropped by Eusebius in his letter to Paulinus: b 33
εἰς μίαν ἀναρχον τῶν ὅλων ἀρχὴν δι' Τίον εὐσεβῶς τὰ πάντα ἀνάγομεν.

The Second Creed of Sirmium belongs to the year 357. The six years which had passed since the date of the First Sirmian had been pregnant with Arian successes, and reverses on the Catholic side. In 353 Constantius became master of the

¹ S. Athan. *de Syn.* 27. Socr. ii. 30. Niceph. ix. 31. In Latin, S. Hilar. *de Syn.* 37.

² εἴ τις τὸ Πν. τὸ Ἀ. Παράκλητον λέγων τὸν ἀγέννητον λέγοι Θεόν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. εἴ τις ὡς ἐδίδαξεν ἡμᾶς ὁ Κύριος μὴ ἄλλον λέγοι τὸν Παράκλητον παρὰ τὸν Υἱὸν ... ἀ. ἐ. εἴ τις τὸ Πν. τὸ Ἀ. μέρος λέγοι τοῦ Πατρὸς ἡ [Ath. καὶ, Socr.] τοῦ Υἱοῦ, ἀ. ἐ.

West. In 355 the Council of Milan, yielding to the Emperor's threats, deposed S. Athanasius. The great See of Alexandria was now in the hands of the usurper George, whose deacon Aetius had already laid the foundation of the Anomœan blasphemy. In the West, Valens and Ursacius were triumphant: Dionysius of Milan had been replaced by Auxentius. Liberius of Rome was an exile in Thrace, S. Hilary of Poitiers in Phrygia; S. Hosius of Cordova, now in his hundredth year, awaited the Emperor's pleasure at Sirmium¹. At Constantinople, Macedonius, who in 350 had regained possession of the see, took the lead in a bitter persecution of all who held the Nicene Faith, whether Catholics or Novatians. On the other hand there were signs of disunion in the Arian camp. Thorough-going Arians were unable to preserve the reticence which had been hitherto so carefully maintained; while the more moderate, who hesitated to call the Son of God a creature, and refused to advance beyond the standpoint of the "Dedication Creed," were forced into a position at first of disapprobation, and ultimately of open antagonism.

The Second Sirmian Creed² was the work of the extreme school. It rejects the Semiarian ὁμοιούσιον equally with the ὁμούσιον of Nicaea. It declares as an "undoubted truth" that the Father is greater than the Son in honour, dignity, glory, and majesty³;

¹ S. Athan. *Hist. Ar. ad Monach.* 45. ἀντὶ ἔξορισμοῦ κατέχει τοῦτον δλον ἐναυτὸν ἐν τῷ Σιρμίῳ.

² S. Hilar. *de Syn.* II. In Greek, S. Athan. *de Syn.* 28. Socr. ii. 30.

³ Nulla ambiguitas est majorem esse Patrem: nulli potest dubium esse Patrem honore, dignitate, claritate, majestate, et ipso nomine Patris majorem esse Filio, Ipso testante, "Qui me misit major me est." The Greek version in S. Athan. (*de Syn.* 27, cf. Socr. ii. 30)

yet it maintains the doctrine of a Trinity as “the sum and safeguard of the Faith¹. ” With regard to the Holy Spirit, it simply adds, with the reserve common to all the earlier confessions of the Arian party, “Paracletus autem Spiritus per Filium est, Qui missus venit juxta promissum ut Apostolos et omnes credentes instrueret doceret sanctificaret.”

On May 22, 359, a third Creed was drawn up at Sirmium². Like the second it is in the interest of Eusebian or Acacian Arianism: yet the wording is more careful and conciliatory. Instead of the ὁμοιούσιον and ὁμοούσιον, it proposed a new formula,—the ὁμοιον κατὰ πάντα. The term οὐσία was to be henceforth abandoned as unscriptural and open to abuse³. But the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is still left undefined. Neither likeness nor unlikeness to the Father is predicated of the Third Person in the Trinity.

Meanwhile, between the dates of the Second and Third Sirmian Creeds, the Semiarians had held a Council at Ancyra, which promised better things. They condemned indeed the ὁμοούσιον, but refused to describe the Son as a κτίσμα. They say, Ἐπιστεύσαμεν οὖν εἰς Πατέρα καὶ Τίὸν καὶ Ἀγιον Πνεῦμα· οὐκ εἰς κτίστην καὶ κτίσμα. ἄλλο γάρ ἐστι κτίστης καὶ κτίσμα, ἄλλο Πατήρ καὶ Τίος⁴. It is remarkable

gives for *claritate, majestate, Θεότητι*, a true gloss no doubt, but not to be pressed.

¹ Illa autem clausula est totius fidei et illa confirmatio [τὸ κεφάλαιον πάσης τῆς πίστεως καὶ ἡ βεβαιότης αὐτῆς] quod Trinitas semper servanda est...Integer, perfectus numerus Trinitatis est.

² S. Ath. *de Syn.* 8. Socr. ii. 37. Niceph. ix. 39. (The “Dated” Creed.)

³ τὸ δὲ ὄνομα τῆς οὐσίας...ἥρεσε...περιαρεθῆναι καὶ παντελῶς μηδεμίαν μνήμην οὐσίας ἐπὶ Θεοῦ εἶναι τοῦ λοιποῦ διὰ τὸ τὰς θείας γραφὰς μηδαμοῦ περὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς [Socr. περὶ Πνεύματος] καὶ Υἱοῦ οὐσίας μεμνήσθαι. ὁμοιον δὲ λέγομεν τὸν Υἱὸν τῷ Πατρὶ κατὰ πάντα, ὡς καὶ αἱ ἄγιαι γραφαὶ λέγουσί τε καὶ διδάσκουσιν.

⁴ S. Epiph. *Hær.* lxxiii.

that the Holy Spirit is carefully excluded from this last statement, as if their judgment with regard to Him were yet in suspense. Among the members of the Synod were Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebastia, and Eleusius of Cyzicus : “sanctissimi viri,” as S. Hilary does not hesitate to call them¹, men of unblemished lives, and in doctrine not far from the Catholic faith ; though their non-acceptance of the ὁμοούσιον² opened the door, ere long, to formal heresy.

A crisis was now at hand. In 359,—the year of the Dated Creed,—East and West were assembled in separate conclaves at Seleucia and Ariminum. The majority of the Eastern Bishops were in favour of the Dedication Creed : the Ariminian Fathers at first held resolutely by the Faith of Nicæa. But at Ariminum Imperial power combined with Arian duplicity prevailed in the end, and the Dated Creed, as previously remodelled at Nicè in Thrace³, was ultimately accepted.

Early in 360 the Acacian party completed their triumph at Constantinople. Under pressure from the Emperor, the deputies of the Eastern Council signed a recension of the Creed of Nicè⁴, and for the

¹ *De Syn.* (ad fin.). Cf. S. Athan. *de Syn.* 41. ὡς ἀδελφοὶ πρὸς ἀδελφοὺς διαλεγόμεθα τὴν αὐτὴν μὲν ἡμῶν διάνοιαν ἔχοντας, περὶ δὲ τὸ ὄνομα μόνον διστάζοντας. He is speaking of such Semiarrians as Basil of Ancyra.

² To which S. Athanasius and the Catholics rightly adhered as being the only ἐπιτείχισμα κατὰ πάσης ἀστεβῶν ἐπινοίας.

³ Theodor. ii. 21. The Creed of Nicè substituted ὁμοῖον for ὁμοῖον κατὰ πάντα.

⁴ S. Athan. *de Syn.* 30. Socr. ii. 41. Niceph. ix. 44. The clause with regard to οὐσία and ὑπόστασις as finally settled stands thus : τὸ δὲ ὄνομα τῆς οὐσίας ... ἥρεσε περιαιρεθῆναι ... ἐπειδήπερ καὶ αἱ θεῖαι γραφαὶ οὐδαμῶς ἐμνημόνευσαν περὶ οὐσίας Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ ὀφεῖται ὑπόστασις περὶ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ Ἀγίου Πνεύματος ὄνομάζεσθαι.

moment it seemed as if the whole Church stood committed to Homœan Arianism. It was of this climax of disasters that S. Jerome afterwards wrote, “Tunc ‘usiæ’ nomen abolitum est: tunc Nicænæ fidei damnatio conclamata est. Ingemuit totus orbis et Arianum se esse miratus est¹.”

The Christian world was or seemed to be Arian. And yet up to this point, the denial of the Holy Spirit's proper Deity, involved in every Arian confession, had been expressed by none. The following are the only indications which we have been able to discover in Arian Creeds previous to 360, that such an extension of Arianism was imminent.

(1) The Creeds generally imply an inequality of the Divine Persons. Thus even the Dedication Creed of 341 speaks of a difference in glory (*τῶν ὀνομάτων σημανόντων ἀκριβῶς τὴν οἰκείαν Ἐκάστοτον... δόξαν*).

(2) Expressions occur which represent the Holy Spirit as occupying a place or fulfilling an office inferior to that of the Son. The Macrostich supplies an instance. It is not obscurely hinted by S. Augustine that the constant and often lengthy reference to the Mission of the Paraclete which is noticeable in almost all the Arian confessions has this object in view. “Quod officium (he says) tanquam Personæ infimæ in illa Trinitate isti Spiritui Sancto deputant².”

(3) It is at least remarkable that whilst in several of these Creeds—the last and worst not excepted—there is no lack of majestic and glorious titles to set forth the dignity of the Son of God,

The Creed of Nicæa had simply rejected the *μία ὑπόστασις [=οὐσία]*: *μήτε δεῖν ἐπὶ προσώπου Π. καὶ Υ. καὶ Ἀ. Π. μίαν ὑπόστασιν ὄνομάζεσθαι.*

¹ *Dial. adv. Lucif.* 19.

² S. Augustin. *c. Semi-Arian.* c. 19.

nothing indeed being withheld from Him but Consubstantiality with the Father, no such attempt is anywhere made to exalt the Person of the Holy Spirit. It may be said that this omission is owing to the fact that His Person had not yet become matter of controversy. Yet the general impression left upon the mind by reading the Arian confessions with a view to ascertain their relation to the doctrine of the Spirit, is certainly unfavourable. Whatever glory or divinity they concede to the Son, less seems to be assigned to the Holy Ghost¹.

But it was not by councils or in creeds that the heresy which denied the Deity of the Holy Spirit was brought to its birth. The leaven must have been working silently in the minds of men from the time that Arius proclaimed the Son to be a creature². The same bold hand which was raised against the Consubstantiality of the Son struck at the root of all true faith in the Deity of the Spirit. The Spirit Whom the Son of God sent from the Father, Who came to glorify the Son, could not be regarded as a more exalted Person than the Only-begotten. Worldly men, such as many of the Eusebian and Acacian school were, might not care to push their heresy to its logical issue; dogma considered as dogma, and apart from political objects, had, in

¹ *E.g.* in the Creed of Nicæ, Christ is described, almost as though in contrast with the Spirit, as ὁ Κύριος καὶ Θεός. The Holy Spirit is simply τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ὅπερ ἔπειψεν.

² Thus S. Hilary, writing before 360, speaks of lax views upon the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as already prevalent among the Arians; and asks, "Quid mirum, ut de Spiritu S. diversa sentiant qui in largitore Ejus creando et demutando et abolendo tam temerari sint auctores?" *De Trin.* ii. 4. Cf. S. Athan. *Or. c. Ar.* i. 8, πῶς περὶ τοῦ Πν. ὄρθα φρονήσει, δυσφημῶν εἰς τὸν τοῦτο χορηγοῦντα Δόγον; S. Cyril also is at great pains to guard catechumens against prevalent errors on this subject: cf. *Catech.* xvi. 5.

truth, little or no interest for them. It was otherwise with speculative minds like those of Aetius and Eunomius: the mere love of novelty in doctrine impelled them to follow out the system of Arius to its full length: whilst no fear of irreverence, no imputations of blasphemy interposed a barrier. The earnest, thoughtful, and not indevout Semiarian school reached the same point by a different course. They saw and avoided the impiety of attributing a created nature to the Only-begotten Son. But they were not equally convinced that the Spirit of Christ was of like essence with the Father. Had Scripture spoken of the Third Person of the Trinity in the same strong and well-defined language which it held with regard to the Second? Had the Church with equal distinctness declared Him to be truly and eternally Divine? If not, it seemed to them that the expressions which Arius had applied to our Lord, and which had been condemned in that application, might not be so blame-worthy or blameworthy at all, if used in reference to the Holy Spirit. Unable to grasp the Catholic conception of the Holy Trinity, unwilling to accept the Arian position as a whole, they fell back upon the middle course of giving up the Deity of the Spirit, while they confessed the Son to be of like essence with the Father. As the result of this compromise, the Semiarian school found themselves on one point in full accord with the most advanced of the Anomoeans: for both alike opposed the teaching of the Church on the doctrine of the Holy Ghost. Both were therefore included in the condemnation pronounced by the Second General Council. In one particular the Semiarian opponents of the orthodox doctrine fared worse than the more violent disciples

of Aetius and Eunomius. With the latter, the denial of the Deity of the Holy Spirit was a secondary heresy, which was thrown into obscurity by their blasphemous attack upon the Deity of the Son. With the former, on the other hand, it was almost the only point upon which they were hopelessly at issue with the Church. Their general orthodoxy made their unbelief on this point more painfully prominent; they came to be regarded as the champions of the latest development of Arianism; and thus it happened that Semiarians rather than Eunomians were branded with the odious name of Pneumatomachi¹.

¹ In allusion to θεομάχοι, Acts v. 39: cf. Suicer. *Thes. Ecclesiast.* s. v.

CHAPTER III.

FROM 360 TO 380.

Εἰ κτίσμα τὸ Πνεῦμα, πῶς εἰς Αὐτὸν πιστεύομεν, ἢ ἐν Αὐτῷ τελειούμεθα;...τί οὖν; Θεὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα; πάνυ γε. τί οὖν; ὄμοούσιον; εἴπερ Θεός.
S. Greg. Nazianz. *Or. Theol.* v.

It was given to S. Athanasius, as he had been the boldest and most vigorous defender of the Catholic Faith touching the Son of God, so also to be the earliest champion of the Church's doctrine of the Holy Ghost. Between 356 and 362 the Archbishop found a refuge in the monasteries and hermitages of the Thebaid. There it was that tidings reached him of the new form which Arian unbelief had assumed. Serapion, Bishop of Thmuis in the Delta, wrote word that some who had left the Arians on account of their blasphemy against the Son, yet entertained notions derogatory to the Person of the Holy Ghost, and spoke of Him as a creature, and a 'ministering spirit,' differing from the angels only in degree¹.

In his reply to Serapion, S. Athanasius betrays no surprise at the new turn which the battle was

¹ S. Athan. *ad Serap.* i. 2. ὡς ἐξελθόντων μέν τινων ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀρειανῶν διὰ τὴν κατὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ βλασφημίαν, φρονούντων δὲ κατὰ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος καὶ λεγόντων Αὐτὸν μὴ μόνον κτίσμα ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν λειτουργικῶν πνευμάτων ἐν Αὐτῷ εἶναι καὶ βαθμῷ μόνον Αὐτὸν διαφέρειν τῶν ἀγγέλων.

taking. He seems to be as fully equipped against this attack as he had been against the earlier heresy. For the new school, at least as they were represented in Lower Egypt, he has little mercy. He calls them “Tropici,” a name apparently derived from their method of escaping from the literal meaning of Holy Scripture; and with a play upon the word, he charges them with a dishonest versatility in their conduct¹. They pretended to have split with the Arians, but their real hostility was directed against the Catholic faith². This double dealing had not escaped the vigilance of Catholics, whilst their partial orthodoxy was unpalatable to their former Arian associates³. A second letter exposes the profanity which had already begun to mark the course of the new heresy, as it had been a conspicuous feature of the earlier Arian teaching. Εἰ οὐκ ἔστι κτίσμα τὸ Ἀγιον Πνεῦμα (the Tropici of the Delta had ventured to reason) νιός ἔστι, καὶ ἀδελφὸς δύο ὁ Λόγος καὶ αὐτός. As an alternative they suggested, Οὐκοῦν πάππος ὁ Πατὴρ καὶ ἔκγονόν ἔστιν Αὐτοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα⁴. Well might the Catholic champion

¹ *Ad Serap.* 10. οἱ τῷ ὅντι τροπικοὶ συνθέμενοι τοῖς Ἀρειανοῖς καὶ μερισάμενοι μετ' αὐτῶν τὴν εἰς τὴν θεότητα βλασφημίαν ἵνα ἐκεῖνοι μὲν τὸν Υἱὸν οὐτοὶ δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα κτίσμα λέγωσιν. They were called Tropici διὰ τὸ λέγειν ἑαυτὸὺς τρόπους ἐφευρίσκειν παρεξηγήσεων, i.e. because they evaded the ordinary Scriptural proofs of the Holy Spirit's Deity by giving to such passages a metaphorical turn. Cf. Steph. *Thes.* s. v.

² *Ib.* I.

³ *Ib.* 32. χάρις τῷ Κυρίῳ ὅτι ὡς γράφεις οὐκ ἔλαθον σκέποντες ἑαυτὸὺς τῇ πρός τοὺς Ἀρειανοὺς προσποιήτῃ ἀντιλογίᾳ· καὶ γὰρ καὶ παρ' ἑκείνων ἐμισῆθησαν ὅτι μόνον τὸ Πνεῦμα καὶ οὐχὶ καὶ τὸν Λόγον κτίσμα λέγοντο· καὶ παρὰ πάντων δὲ κατεγνώσθησαν ὡς τῷ ὅντι πνευματομαχοῦντες...

⁴ Some 15 or 20 years later S. Didymus renewes this charge against the Egyptian Pneumatomachi. They argued, “Si Spiritus S. creatus non est, aut pater est Dei Patris aut patruus est Unigeniti, aut filius Christi est, aut nepos est Dei Patris aut ipse Filius Dei est.” His remark is, “Miseri atque miserabiles non sentientes de incorporeis et invisibi-

retort, “Who would suppose that these men were Christians and not pagans¹? ” Yet, he adds, your Eunomii, your Eudoxii and Eusebii are prepared to use this language. Once let men act the part of Arians, and no impiety will be too monstrous for their tongues to utter. Out of the abundance of their own hearts this blasphemous folly proceeds; not out of Holy Scripture; nor from any tradition or teaching in harmony with Scripture².

The death of Constantius in 361, and of George in the following summer, set S. Athanasius free to return to Alexandria. On being restored to his See, it was one of his first acts to hold a Council of Catholic Bishops, at which representatives were present of the Western as well as of the Egyptian Church. The synodical letter of this Council of Alexandria deals in passing with the rising heresy of the Pneumatomachi. It requires Catholics, who, having signed Arian Creeds desired to be reconciled to the Church, to anathematize those “who say that the Holy Spirit is a creature and of a different and separate essence from Our Lord” (*διηρημένον ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ*)³. For (continues the Council) there is no way of really escaping from the infection of Arianism except by maintaining that the Holy Trinity is indivisible and altogether uncreate. It was in vain that opposers of the Holy Spirit’s Deity persuaded themselves that they held by the Nicene faith: *οἱ γὰρ προσποιούμενοι μὲν ὀνομάζειν τὴν ὁμο-*

libus juxta corporalium et visibilium disputare non licere naturam.”
Didym. *De Sp. S. ad fin.*

¹ *Ad Serap. IV. 1. 2.*

² *Ad Serap. iv. 5.* τίς γὰρ αὐτοῖς παρέδωκε τοῦτο; τίς ὁ διδάξας; δλλ’ οὐδεὶς ἐπὶ τῶν θείων γραφῶν ἐκ δὲ τοῦ περισσεύματος τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν ἔξιλθεν ἡ τουατή παραφροσύνη.

³ S. Athan. *Tom. ad Antiochen.*

λογηθεῖσαν ἐν Νικαίᾳ πίστιν τολμῶντες δὲ κατὰ τοῦ Ἅγιου Πνεύματος βλασφημένην, οὐδὲν πλέον ποιῶσιν ἢ τὴν Ἀρειανὴν αἵρεσιν τοῖς μὲν ρήμασιν ἀρνοῦνται τῷ δὲ φρονήματι ταύτην κατέχουσιν.

Sozomen adds¹ that this Council confessed the Holy Ghost to be consubstantial with the Father and the Son. The exact words do not appear in the synodical letter: but the Consubstantiality of the Spirit is plainly involved in the language already cited, and in the approval which the Council gives to certain who confessed that the Holy Spirit is οὐ κτίσμα οὐδὲ ξένον ἀλλ' ἴδιον καὶ ἀδιάίρετον τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Τίον καὶ τοῦ Πατρός. The term itself had already been applied to the Holy Spirit by S. Athanasius in his first letter to Serapion².

Passing from Alexandria to Constantinople we find that there also the new heresy had broken out, nearly at the same time that S. Athanasius and his Council were grappling with it in Egypt. Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret³ are agreed in dating the rise of the Eastern Pneumatomachi from the deposition of Macedonius, which took place in 360 upon the triumph of the Acacian or Homoean party. Further, but with less probability, they trace the origin of the sect to Macedonius himself. Socrates and Sozomen say that hostility to the Acacians who had caused his downfall induced Macedonius to espouse the Semiarian cause, and to make overtures to Semiarian leaders for the maintenance of the Dedication Creed and of the ὁμοιούσιον. The party

¹ Sozom. v. 12. Cf. Socr. III. 7. τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα θεολογήσαντες, τῇ ὁμοούσιῳ Τριάδι συνανελαμβάνοντο.

² Ad. Serap. I. 27. οὐκ ἔστι τῶν πολλῶν τὸ Πνεῦμα ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἄγγελος ἀλλ' ἐν ὅν, μᾶλλον δὲ τοῦ Λόγου ἐνδεῖτος ἴδιον, καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνδεῖτος ἴδιον καὶ ὁμοούσιόν ἔστιν.

³ Socr. II. 45. Sozom. IV. 27. Theod. II. 6.

which he thus contrived to gather round him came to be known as Macedonians¹: and amongst them were such men as Eustathius of Sebastia, Eleusius of Cyzicus, and Sophronius of Pompeiopolis. After a while, it seems, the question arose whether the ὁμοιούσιον which they professed should be extended to the Holy Spirit. Eustathius refused to decide: ἔγώ, ἔφη, οὐτε Θεὸν ὄνομάζειν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἁγιον αἴρονται οὐτε κτίσμα καλεῖν τολμήσαιμι. Macedonius had no such scruples. Τὸ Ἁγιον Πνεῦμα συναναλαβέω εἰς τὴν θεολογίαν τῆς Τριάδος ἔξεκλινε, says Socrates: Sozomen, describing perhaps a more advanced stage of the heresy, asserts that he called the Holy Spirit a ‘minister’ and ‘servant’², and “such other names as one might without offence apply to the Angels of God.” The sect now began to be styled *Pneumatomachi* by the maintainers of the Nicene Faith. They were especially numerous in the neighbourhood of Constantinople³ and in Thrace, along the shores of the Hellespont, and in Bithynia. Their blameless lives, grave manners, ascetic habits and persuasive speech, gained for them a respectful hearing, and enlisted a large number of the laity on their side.

Theodoret adds that Macedonius had from the first shared in the denial of the Holy Spirit’s Deity, which was common to all Arians: and that

¹ They were also called Marathonians from one Marathonius, a wealthy monk who had founded at Constantinople a συνοικία μοναχῶν. He assisted the party with his purse, as well as by personal influence and effort. Sozom. iv. 27. Niceph. Callist. IX. 47.

² διάκονον καὶ ὑπηρέτην. Cf. Photius, *Eph.* I. εἰς δούλους καὶ ὑπηρέτας τὴν δεσποτικὴν καὶ ὑπερκειμένην αὐτοῦ [sc. τοῦ Πνεύματος] συνέταπτε κυριότητα.

³ Yet at Constantinople the sect had neither church nor Bishop till the reign of Arcadius, owing to the intolerance of the stricter Arians. Sozom. iv. 27.

for this reason he had been originally selected by the advanced Arians to fill the See of Constantinople. From his views upon the Person of the Spirit they concluded that he symbolized with them in their doctrine of the Son. His deposition followed upon the discovery that he held the ὁμοιόστορ. But the story sounds like an attempt to account for Macedonius being deposed by the men who had raised him to the episcopal throne. Macedonius was enthroned in 350, and it is not probable that any distinct views on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit were held at that time by the Arians generally. That Macedonius, Arian at heart, had always implicitly entertained an unsound faith upon the subject is no doubt true enough. The events which threw him into the arms of the Semiarians did not compel him to abandon his latent unbelief on this point; and as an ambitious intriguer he may have purposely placed himself at the head of the new movement, which found many supporters amongst his Semiarian allies. Thus in becoming a Semiarian leader, he became a pronounced Πνευματομάχος, and the Semiarian clique who bore his name were ere long identified in the popular conception with the opponents of the Deity of the Holy Ghost¹.

¹ Epiphanius (*Hær. LXXIV.*) speaks of the Pneumatomachi as the monstrous and unnatural issue of Semiarianism and orthodoxy, διφνεῖς καὶ ἡμίπλαστοι ὡς τῶς Κενταύρους ἡ Πᾶνας ἡ Σειρῆνας οἱ ἀναγράψαντες τοὺς μίθους ἐπανέστησαν ἡμῖν. He distinguishes two parties; (1) those who held the Son to be ἀχρόνως κεκτισμένος, and (2) those who held the orthodox faith as to His Consubstantiality with the Father—e. g. some of the followers of Meletius of Antioch (*Hær. LXXXI.*). Both were equally averse to the συναριθμητική of the Spirit. Cf. *Anacephr.* οὗτοι περὶ μὲν Χριστοῦ καλῶς ἔχουσι τὸ δὲ Πν. τὸ Ἀ. βλασφημούσιον: where καλῶς seems to cover the ὁμοιόστορ as well as the Catholic doctrine.

S. Gregory of Nazianzus (*Orat. XXXVII.*) draws a further distinc-

Of Macedonius himself little more is known. Nicephorus relates¹ that he retired to a place to the east of Constantinople, and there continued to the end of his life to maintain his opposition to the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Spirit. But his name makes no figure in the history of the controversy beyond its use in designating the sect; for the story of his appearance at the Council of Constantinople rests on insufficient evidence².

In 364—5 the Semiarian, or as they were now called the Macedonian, party, held an important Synod at Lampsacus, on the Hellespont, where as we have seen they were in full strength. Simultaneous meetings appear to have taken place at Smyrna and in other parts of Asia Minor. The Lampsacene Council declared the proceedings of the Acacians at Constantinople in 360 null and void: rejected the Ariminian Creed and adopted that of

tion between various shades of heterodoxy on the doctrine of the Spirit. Some (1) οὗτε σέβονσι οὗτε ἀτιμάζουσι: others (2) μέχρι διανοίας εἰσὶν εὐσεβεῖς, refusing only the name of GOD: whilst a third class (3) τολμῶσιν εὐσεβεῖν καὶ τοῖς χειλεσι. Besides all these, there were the strict Pneumatomachi, who, with more or less distinctness, defined the Holy Spirit to be a creature. Cf. *Or. XLIV.* τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς σοφῶν οἱ μὲν ἐνέργειαν τοῦτο ὑπέλαβον, οἱ δὲ κτίσμα, οἱ δὲ θεόν.

The Semiarians seem to have been of one mind with the Pneumatomachi as to the Holy Spirit (*Epiph. Anacephr. κτίσμα παντελῶς ὄριζουσι*): but less diversity of opinion prevailed amongst them with regard to the Son. Ultimately, however, they became nearly synonymous with the Pneumatomachi, and at Constantinople the sects were identified (*Ημαρείνων ἡγούν ΙV. Can. I. Conc. Const.*).

¹ *Hist. IX.* 46. ὁ δὲ Μακεδόνιος τὴν τῆς Κωνσταντίνου ἐκλησίαν ἀφαιρεθεῖς, ἀντιτέραν τῆς πόλεως πρὸς ἔω εἴς τι χωρίον φ Πύλας ὄνομα ἐπὶ πολὺ διετρίβωτο κάκεισε τὴν κατὰ τοῦ Ἀγίου Πνεύματος βλασφημίαν ἀπύλφοτομάτι ἐξερευξόμενος κακῶς τὸ βιοῦν ἐξεμέτρει.

² Photius (*Eph. I.*) states that he was condemned by the Council of Constantinople: οὗτος ὁ ἱεροφάντης χορὸς Μακεδόνιον τινα...ὅτι τὸ πανάγιον καὶ ζωαρχικὸν ἐνσοφῆμει Πνεύμα εὐθύνας ἐδικάιον δοῦναι. But this condemnation was virtual only: and the name of the heresiarch does not appear in the genuine Canons. See Ch. IV.

Antioch and Seleucia. So far Sozomen¹. From Socrates we learn that ‘the so-called doctrine of Macedonius’ (by which, after his own account of Macedonianism in a previous chapter, he can scarcely mean any other than the error of the Pneumatomachi) was brought into prominence on this occasion : τὸ χρηματίσαν Μακεδονίου δόγμα μικρόν τε ἐμπροσθεν... ἐν τῇ κατὰ Λαμψάκον συνόδῳ γενόμενον φανερώτερον. Yet the following year witnessed a remarkable *rapprochement* between Semiarians and Catholics. Driven by the persecutions of Valens to seek support from the West, the deputies of the Lampsacene Council presented an orthodox confession to Liberius Bishop of Rome. They acknowledged the Nicene Faith, including the ὄμοούσιον, which they regarded as substantially identical with their own formula : τὸ ὄμοούσιον ὄνομα δέχονται ὡς τῷ ὄμοιῷ κατ' οὐσίαν τὰ αὐτὰ σημαῖνον². First among the Bishops who subscribed this document stands the name of Eustathius of Sebastia. We must therefore suppose that his indecision with regard to the doctrine of the Spirit had not yet ripened into open heresy. Had the Lampsacene Council or the delegates committed themselves to a formal support of the doctrine of the Pneumatomachi, it seems impossible to believe that Liberius could have been deceived by their professed adhesion to the Creed of Nicæa.

The subject did not, at any rate, come under consideration during the interview with Liberius. There is extant in Socrates a letter to the Bishops of Asia in which the Bishop of Rome declares himself fully satisfied with the orthodoxy of Eustathius and his colleagues. The verdict of the Roman See was endorsed by other Churches. From Rome the

¹ Sozom. vi. 7.² Socr. iv. 12.

Lampsacene deputies went on to Sicily, where they renewed their profession of the Homoousion : from Sicily they proceeded to Cappadocia, where a Synod met at Tyana to receive the letters of Liberius and of the Sicilian Catholics. Arrangements were now made for a great Council at Tarsus in the following spring, at which the reconciliation between the Semiarian body and the Church was to have been completed. But meanwhile some four-and-thirty of the less flexible members of the Macedonian party met and denounced the ὁμοούσιον ; the Emperor under the influence of Eudoxius forbade the proposed Synod ; and the scheme of comprehension which had been dictated by the policy of the Semiarians and promoted by the charity of Liberius fell through and came to nought.

Liberius died in 366, and was succeeded by a Bishop of more resolute orthodoxy. The remainder of the struggle which we are reviewing was fought out during the long and eventful episcopate of S. Damasus.

S. Athanasius was still active in the defence of Trinitarian doctrine. He had written to Jovian on that Emperor's accession in 363¹, "We must all abide by the Nicene Faith and not suffer it to be disturbed by the fair speeches and verbal quibbles of heretics like the Arians. The Council of Nicæa... did not represent the Holy Spirit as alien to the Essence of the Father and the Son, but on the contrary glorified Him with the Father and the Son, in the one faith of the Holy Trinity." In the name of a Synod of Libyan and Egyptian

¹ *Ad Jovian.* 4. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἀπηλλογίωσαν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἀγιον ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον συνεδόξασαν αὐτὸ τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ ἐν τῇ μιᾷ τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος πίστει διὰ τὸ καὶ μίαν εἶναι ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ Τριάδι Θεότητα.

Bishops, he now wrote to Damasus, "the Bishop of great Rome," begging that Auxentius of Milan might be included in the condemnation which had been passed by a Roman Synod upon Valens and Ursacius¹. From his *Letter to the Bishops of Africa*, which contains an account of this matter, it would seem that the Arians of the West as well as those of Egypt and the East had been active in opposing the Deity of the Spirit². The closing words of this letter are too weighty to be omitted. 'Η ἐν Νικαίᾳ σύνοδος (writes the veteran of the Nicene Faith) ἀληθῶς στηλογραφία κατὰ πάσης αἰρέσεως ἔστιν' αὕτη καὶ τοὺς βλασφημοῦντας εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἀγιον καὶ λέγοντας Αὐτὸν κτίσμα ἀνατρέπει. εἰρηκότες γὰρ οἱ πατέρες περὶ τῆς εἰς τὸν Τίὸν πίστεως ἐπήγαγον εὐθύς, 'Πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον' ὡν τελείαν καὶ πλήρη τὴν εἰς τὴν ἀγίαν Τριάδα πίστιν ὅμολογήσαντες τὸν χαρακτῆρα τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ πίστεως καὶ τὴν διδασκαλίαν τῆς Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἐν τούτῳ γνωρίσωσι...Οὐδεὶς ἀν Χριστιανῶν ἀμφίβολον εἰς τοῦτο σχοίη τὴν διάνοιαν ὡς οὐκ ἔστιν ήμῶν η πίστις εἰς τὴν κτίσιν ἀλλ' εἰς ἓν Θεὸν Πατέρα...καὶ εἰς ἓν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν...καὶ εἰς ἐν Πνεῦμα Ἀγιον ἓν θεὸν τὸν ἐν τῇ ἀγίᾳ καὶ τελείᾳ Τριάδι γινωσκόμενον· εἰς ἦν καὶ βαπτιζόμενοι καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ συναπτόμενοι τῇ θεότητι πιστεύομεν καὶ κληρονομήσαι βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦν τῷ Κυρίῳ ημῶν.

The appeal of S. Athanasius and his Bishops was successful. A Council of Italian and Gallican Bishops assembled at Rome under Damasus, probably in 371. Two forms are extant of the synodical letter put forth by this Council. Both contain a

¹ Cf. Athan. *Ep. ad Afr.*

² This is asserted with regard to Auxentius by Theodoret (vi. 33): ἐπεχέρει νεωτερίζειν...καὶ τὰ ἵστα φρονεῖν τοὺς ἀνόμοιον [τὸν Υἱὸν] καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα δοξάζουσι κατὰ τὴν ὑστερον ἐπιγενομένην ζήτησιν.

deliberate condemnation by the Western Church of the now rapidly growing heresy. One of these documents is addressed to the Catholic Bishops of the East. It maintains that the Nicene Fathers taught the Father, Son and Holy Spirit to be “*unius deitatis, unius virtutis, unius figuræ, unius substantiæ.*” Attached to this letter is a fragment in which the Westerns say, “*Nullo modo Spiritum Sanctum separamus, sed perfectum in omnibus virtute honore majestate deitate cum Patre conveneramur et Filio*¹. ”

The other document is given in Greek by Sozomen and Theodoret². It warns the Bishops of Illyria against Arianism, which is reported to have its zealous advocates in Illyria. One sentence only refers to the controversy on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit: but it sufficiently expresses the mind of the Council upon the subject. “We ought to believe (they say) that the Holy Ghost is of the same substance³ [with the Father and the Son]. He who thinks otherwise we judge to be alien from our Communion.”

From Illyria itself we receive a still stronger testimony to the orthodoxy upon this question of the Western Church. Theodoret⁴ and Nicephorus⁵ have preserved a synodical letter of the Illyrian Bishops addressed to the Churches and Bishops of Asia, Phrygia, Carophrygia and Pacatiana⁶. After long investigation of this subject (so the letter runs) they have arrived at the conclusion that the Trinity

¹ Mansi, *Concil.* III. p. 462.

² Sozom. VI. 27. Theodor. II. 22.

³ ὑποστάσεως, Sozom. i. καὶ οὐσίας, Theodoret.

⁴ IV. 9. ⁵ XI. 30.

⁶ Valesius proposes Φρυγίας, Καπίας, Φρυγίας Πακατιανῆς. Phrygia Pacatiana was the western division, “down to the frontiers of Caria.” (Smith, *Dict. Geogr.* s.v. *Phrygia*.)

is consubstantial. They had heard with horror of the new heresy rising in the East, which separated the Holy Spirit from the essence of the Father and the Son. The Consubstantiality of the Holy Trinity, the conglorification of Father, Son and Spirit, was the Faith of the Fathers of Nicæa. This letter was followed by an Imperial Epistle from Valentinian, Valens, and Gratian. The Emperors confirm the decision of the Illyrian Synod, citing also the language of recent Roman and Gallican Councils. They proceed to declare their faith in a Cons substancial Trinity: μίαν εἶναι καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Τιοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἀγίου Πνεύματος, ἐν τρισὶ προσώποις, τουτέστιν ἐν τρισὶ τελείαις ὑποστάσεσιν.

The date of these important letters is unfortunately obscure. Baronius¹ places them as early as 365 (366?), identifying the Eustathius who is mentioned in the Illyrian Epistle with Eustathius of Sebastia, and inferring that the Synod was held during the negotiations between Liberius and the deputies of the Lampsacene Council. This view has the support of Nicephorus, who seems to connect the letters with the times of Liberius². But the

¹ Baronius, *Annal.* iv. 191. Cf. Pagi, I. 510.

² Sozomen, though he does not mention the Illyrian letters, speaks of a reopening of the question εἰ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἀγίου Πατρί τε καὶ Υἱῷ ὄμοούσιον δοξάζειν προσῆκεν, and thus proceeds: μαθὼν δὲ Ρώμης ἐπίσκοπος ἔγραψε ταῖς ἀνὰ τὴν ἔω ἐκκλησίαις σὺν τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς δύσεως ἱερεῦσι Τριάδα ὄμοούσιον καὶ ὄμόδοξον πρεσβεύειν (vi. 22). He adds “about this time Liberius died.” Nicephorus infers that the Bishop of Rome who wrote to the Easterns was Liberius, and connects with this supposed letter of Liberius the proceedings of the Illyrian Bishops and the Emperors. The Roman letter was probably that of the Synod assembled by Damasus, and the Synod of the Illyrian Bishops may fitly find place after the Synod of Rome. Accepting Theodoret’s facts, it will fall in the year 374-5, between the consecration of S. Ambrose and the death of Valentinian (Pusey, *Councils*, p. 253).

mention of Gratian's name as an Imperator; the distinct reference to the heresy of the Pneumatomachi, which in 365 could hardly have attracted the notice of the West; the definite language adopted by the Council in reference to the Consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son,—all seem to point to a later date. Theodoret represents the Illyrian Synod as held by command of Valentinian, and (apparently) after the consecration of S. Ambrose, which took place in 374; and to that year or the next we may venture to assign it, pending a fuller knowledge of the subject. One thing is clear. The West was sound upon the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Sozomen is right when he asserts that, with the exception of the few Arian Bishops who were condemned by the Synods of Rome, οὐτε Ῥωμαίων διεφέροντο [περὶ δογμάτων] οὐτε ἔτεροι τῶν ἀνὰ τὴν δύσιν, ἀλλὰ πάντες τὰ δόξαντα τοῖς ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνελθοῦσιν ἐπήνουν, καὶ Τριάδα ἴστοιμόν τε καὶ ἴσοδύναμον ἐδόξαζον¹.

We turn now to the East, where from 370 to 380 the battle raged fiercely. During nearly the whole of this decade the history of the controversy centres round the great champion on the orthodox side, S. Basil of Cappadocian Cæsarea. When he falls his place is taken by another Cappadocian, the friend of Basil's early days, S. Gregory of Nazianzus. It pleased God to raise up worthy defenders of the Faith on the spot where it was principally attacked.

S. Basil was consecrated to the See of Cæsarea

¹ VI. 23. In the next chapter he adds, Οἱ μὲν οὖν πρὸς δύσιν Ἱερεῖς ὡδε φθάσαντες τοὺς παρ' αὐτοῖς νεωτερίζοντας ἐπιμελῶς ἐφύλαττον τὴν ἀρχῆθεν παραδοθεῖσαν αὐτοῖς πίστιν· ὡς κομιδῇ ὀλίγους ἐνθάδε ἐτεροδόξους γενέσθαι καὶ σχέδον μόνους τοὺς ἀμφὶ τὸν Αὐξέντιον.

in 370. His first connection, however, with this controversy seems to have been prior to his consecration. His *Refutation of the Apology of the Heretic Eunomius* is certainly his earliest controversial work¹.

It has been said that the Semiarians, in denying the Deity of the Spirit, found themselves in company with the extreme Anomœans, from whose sentiments on the Person of Christ they recoiled with aversion. "Herein," says Sozomen, "those who held Anomœan and Homœousian views were agreed, that they both maintained the Spirit to be a 'ministering' being, third in order and in honour, and in essence distinct²." It seems probable that the Eunomians were indeed the first³ and principal offenders in this matter, though their heretical opinion as to the Spirit attracted less notice than that of the Macedonians, because it was overlooked in the greater number and extent of their attacks upon the Faith.

Aetius, the founder of Anomœan Arianism, had been banished by Constantius in 360⁴. He was, however, recalled by Julian, and afterwards raised to the Episcopate. On his death in 367, his mantle fell on Eunomius, who continued for some five-and-twenty years to propagate the ἀνόμοιον, extending the doctrine in an intensified form to the Person of

¹ *Adv. Eunom.* I. I. εἰ μὲν ἐβούλοντο πάντες κ.τ.λ....καὶ νῦν ἀν πάντως ἦν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐτιμήσαμεν σιωπὴν ἡσπασάμεθα. Cf. *Vita Basil.* (Migne), c. xviii.

² Sozom. VI. 22. ἀμφότεροι γὰρ διακονικὸν καὶ τρίτον τῇ τάξει καὶ τῇ τιμῇ καὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ ἄλλοιον τὸ Πνεύμα ἴσχυρίζοντο.

³ S. Basil. *adv. Eunom.* ii. 33. οὐκον τινὸς μέχρι τήμερον ἀκηκόαμεν δημιούργημα τὸ "Α. Πν. προσειπόντος.

⁴ A *συνταγμάτιον* of Aetius is extant in Epiph. *Hær.* LXXV.; and for some fragments of his writings see Mai *Nov. Coll.* VII. 1. 7. His boast was, Οὗτως οἶδα τὸν θεόν ὡς ἔμαυτὸν καὶ οὐ τοσοῦτον οἶδα ἔμαυτὸν ὡς τὸν θεόν.

the Holy Spirit. “Eunomius (writes S. Augustine) asserted that the Son was altogether dissimilar to the Father and the Spirit to the Son¹.” “The Eunomians (says Philastrius) believe in three Essences different in kind, which they compare to gold, silver, and brass : they hold that the Son was made by the Father and the Spirit by the Son : thus the Son is unlike the Father, being a Creature, and the Spirit unlike the Son, inasmuch as He was made by the Son²,” a doctrine which, as he truly remarks, bears more resemblance to paganism than to Catholic Christianity. However, in this instance we are not compelled to accept the testimony of adverse writers. Two of the productions of Eunomius have fortunately been preserved. The shorter of these is an *Exposition of the Faith*, which was offered to Theodosius after the Council of Constantinople. It describes the Holy Spirit as γενόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς καὶ τοῦ [fors. αὐτοῦ] καθάπαξ ὑποτεταγμένον· οὗτε κατὰ τὸν Πατέρα οὗτε τῷ Πατρὶ συναριθμούμενον οὗτε τῷ Τίῳ συνεξισούμενον οὗτε μὴν ἄλλω τινὶ συντασσόμενον.....πρῶτον ἔργον καὶ κράτιστον τοῦ Μονογενοῦς. Thus the Son is inferior to the Father, but superior to the Spirit: τοῦ μὲν γὰρ ἐλάττων ἐστὶν ὡς ποίημα, τοῦ δὲ κρείττων ὡς ποιητής.....The other extant work is the *Apology*, which S. Basil attacked. It is even more explicit in its doctrine of a created Spirit of God. In this treatise Eunomius is far from throwing doubt on the personality of the

¹ S. Aug. *de Hæres.* LIV. The Anomœan Council of Antioch in 361 set forth ὅτι παντελῶς ἀνόμοιός ἐστιν ὁ Υἱὸς τῷ Πατρὶ. From their naked Arianism these Anomœans were also known as Exucontians (S. Athan. *de Syn.* 31). Eunomius ventured to call the Son τοῦ Πατρὸς δοῦλον καὶ ὑπηρέτην, and the Holy Spirit τοῦ Υἱοῦ τροφοβερόντ, [fors. φορετὸν ν. φόρετρον, mittendarium] Philostorg. vi. 2 (ed. Gothofred.).

² Philastr. *de Hæres.* 68. Cf. Epiph. *Anacephal.*

Spirit, and condemns the folly of resolving His existence into a simple ἐνέργεια¹,—an idea which seems to have found favour with some of the Macedonian party². He regards Him as a Person, but a created Person. If the Spirit is third in order, how can He be equal in nature to the First or even to the Second Person of the Trinity? He is honoured next after the Only Begotten Son, as being the first and greatest of the works of the Son, destitute indeed of Deity and of creative power, but full of the power which teaches and sanctifies³. The *Apology* ends with a sort of Anomœan Creed, which may be condensed as follows :

εἰς ἔστι θεός, ἀγένητος ἀκτιστος ἀποίητος·
 εἰς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός... γέννημα τοῦ ἀγενήτου,
 οὐχ ὡς ἐν τῶν γεννημάτων, κτίσμα τοῦ ἀκτίστου...
 ποίημα τοῦ ἀποιήτου·
 ἐν Πνεύμα Ἀγιον πρῶτον καὶ μεῖζον πάντων
 τῶν τοῦ Μονογενοῦς ἔργων, προστάγματι
 μὲν τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐνεργείᾳ δὲ καὶ δυνάμει
 τοῦ Τίον γενόμενον⁴.

¹ Eunom. *Apologet.* (ap. Fabricii *Bibl. Græc.* VIII. 298).

² S. Aug. *de Hær.* LII. “Quamvis a nonnullis perhibeantur (Macedoniani) non Deum sed Deitatem Patris et Filii dicere Spiritum Sanctum et nullam propriam habere substantiam.” A few of the school probably held this view : cf. S. Greg. Naz. *Or.* XLIV (cited above, p. 53)

³ θεότητος μὲν καὶ δημιουργικῆς δυνάμεως ἀπολειπόμενον ἀγιαστικῆς δὲ καὶ διδασκαλικῆς πεπληρωμένου.

⁴ The Eunomian doctrine of the Spirit is even more boldly expressed in the fragments of Arian sermons collected by Cardinal Mai (*Scriptor. veterum nova Collectio*, III. p. 202 seq.). In one of these the preacher says, “Spiritum Sanctum Deum non dicimus quia nec Scriptura dicit (the old argument on the Arian side) sed subditum Dei Filio et mandatis illius Filio in omnibus obtemperantem sicut Filius Patri. Et quemadmodum Pater totam virtutem et totam sapientiam et bonitatem in substitutionem Fili consignavit, ita et Filius totam virtutem &c. in Spiritu Sancto, Patre jubente, monstravit. In

It was against this extreme school of opponents of the Holy Spirit's Godhead that S. Basil first found himself called to write. His *Refutation* answers the *Apology* paragraph by paragraph, the 3rd Book dealing at length with the doctrine of the Spirit. It tears the argument of Eunomius to tatters. Why should 'third in order' necessarily mean 'third in nature'? How could the name of a created being have found place in the baptismal formula together with the Father and the Son? How can a creature possess the power of sanctifying? The last sentence reads a wholesome lesson to the profane curiosity which marked the school of Aetius and indeed the Arian party as a whole. "A pious mind will fear to attribute to the Holy Spirit things of which Holy Scripture does not drop a hint. It believes that the full and accurate conception of His Person is reserved for a future life, when we shall have got beyond the 'seeing through a glass darkly,' and shall be permitted to behold the truth face to face."

illo itaque Spirito Sanctu arc[h]angeli et angeli et omnes Sancti adorant Filium et per Filium Patrem [with a reference (appy) to the Arian form of the doxology, Ικαρπὶ διὰ Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι Ἄγιῳ].” Another fragment says : “ Hic Spiritus non est Deus nec Dominus, quoniam nec Creator...non est Deus sed minister Christi Fili Dei sui.” *Fragn. XIII.* even adds, “ Non colendus neque adorandus...Filiū adorat ipse solus sine mediatore, per quem factus est ante omnia, sicuti et Filius...Patrem adorat.”

An 'Arian Sermon' is preserved in S. Augustine's works (viii. 954—960) which contains the following propositions :

Filius a Patre est genitus : Spiritus S. per Filium est factus :

Filius subditus est Patri : Sp. S. subditus est Filio :

Filius adorat et honorat Patrem : Sp. S. adorat et honorat Filium.

Pater major est Filio suo : Filius incomparabiliter major et melior est Spiritu.

Pater Deus et Dominus est Filio suo : F. Deus et Dominus est Spiritui.

S. Athanasius died in 373. Before his death he was able to rejoice that the Catholic cause had found a new and worthy champion in the Archbishop of Cæsarea. Two letters are extant¹ in which the Alexandrian Patriarch speaks of his Cappadocian brother as “our beloved Basil, that true servant of God, the glory of Christ.” S. Basil’s teaching had been misrepresented, and from whatever cause his name was unpopular with the Cæsarean monks. S. Athanasius does not enter into particulars, but contents himself with pleading that his friend had in all good conscience become as “weak to the weak that he might gain the weak.” We are left to gather the facts from S. Gregory of Nazianzus, who in his funeral oration over Basil supplies the clue. It seems that the Archbishop, while earnestly maintaining the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Spirit, had hesitated in public preaching to call Him GOD. He knew that the opponents of the Spirit’s Deity were watching their opportunity. Had the actual Name of GOD been used in reference to the Third Person of the Trinity, they would have risen, and, on the plea of resisting blasphemy, expelled S. Basil from his See, which would then have been immediately filled by a Macedonian Prelate. In private conversations with Gregory, Basil not only asserted again and again the Godhead of the Spirit, but even confirmed his statement with a solemn imprecation, ἐπαρασάμενος ἔαντῳ τὸ φρικωδέστατον, αὐτοῦ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐκπεσεῖν εἰ μὴ σέβοι τὸ Πνεῦμα μετὰ Πατρὸς καὶ Τίον ὡς ὁμοούσιον καὶ ὄμότιμον². In public he had taught the full truth in substance, if not in words: and “our salvation (Gregory re-

¹ *Ad Joann. et Antioch. and Ad Palladium.*

² *Greg. Naz. Or. xx (=XLIII).*

minds the objectors) does not rest on words, but on facts¹..." In his Epistles we find S. Basil pressing on the more candid of the Semiarians the application to the Holy Spirit of the Divine Name², and his own use of it in reference to the Spirit is frequent. But he thought it unnecessary to flourish an obnoxious term in the face of his opponents³, when the truth could be secured independently of the term⁴. Nor would he insist on its adoption as a test of orthodoxy. Many of the Pneumatomachi were feeling their way back to the Faith, and if they could go so far as to reject the blasphemy which made the Spirit of God a creature, it was his opinion that they ought to be restored to communion. Intercourse with Catholics, friendly debate, and above all the grace of Christ, would perfect that which was lacking in their faith. He adds in words that well express the loving spirit which never deserted this zealous champion of the truth, Οὐδὲν γὰρ οὐτῶς ἴδιον ἔστι Χριστιανοῦ ὡς τὸ εἰρηνοποιεῖν⁵.

From the vague suspicions which this wise and conciliatory conduct aroused among the orthodox, S. Basil had two opportunities of clearing

¹ οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐν ῥήμασιν ἡμῖν εἶναι τὴν σωτηρίαν μᾶλλον ἢ πράγμασιν.

² Cf. *Eph.* lxxx. καν θεὸν εἴπης τὸν αὐτὸν ἐνεθείξω ὃν διὰ τῶν λοιπῶν δύνομάτων ἐνοίησας, κ.τ.λ.

³ Notwithstanding S. Basil's charitable self-restraint, the cry of Tritheism was raised : τρεῖς Θεοὺς πρεσβεύεσθαι παρ' ἡμῖν αἰτιῶνται. (*Eph.* lxxx.) It continued to the last the war-cry of the Arians : εἰ Θέος, φασί, καὶ θεὸς καὶ θεὸς πῶς οὐχὶ τρεῖς θεοί; S. Greg. Naz. (*Or.* xxxvii.). He retorts that if the Catholics were guilty of tritheism, the Pneumatomachi who acknowledged the Godhead of the Son were *ditheists*.

⁴ See especially *Eph.* cxli.

⁵ *Eph.* ccxi. (To the Clergy of Tarsus, on the course to be pursued with regard to persons desirous to return to the communion of the Church from the heresy of the Pneumatomachi.)

himself. On both occasions he came boldly to the front.

In 373 Eustathius of Sebastia, who had headed the Lampsacene deputation to Rome, and had been restored by Liberius to the communion of the Church upon subscribing the Nicene Creed, began to shew himself again in his true colours. S. Basil wrote to require a fresh subscription, including a condemnation of the new heresy¹: *χρή ἀναθεματίζειν τοὺς λέγοντας κτίσμα τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ "Αγιον, καὶ τοὺς μὴ ὁμολογοῦντας Αὐτὸ φύσει ἄγιον εἶναι...ἀλλ' ἀποξενοῦντας ἀπὸ τῆς Θείας καὶ μακαρίας φύσεως...ἀναθεματίζειν δὲ καὶ τοὺς λειτουργικὸν λέγοντας τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ "Αγιον ὡς διὰ τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης εἰς τὴν τοῦ κτίσματος κατάγοντας τάξιν.* A complete list, it might have been supposed, of all the phases which this form of unbelief could assume. Eustathius however deliberately and publicly subscribed the anathema. After this he propagated the doctrine of the Pneumatomachi, or worse²; and Basil at last wrote to warn the Bishops of the West against his treachery. Eustathius on his part charged Basil with being a ‘Homousiast,’ and with innovating on the old Scriptural faith. The relapsed heretic ultimately became one of the Archbishop’s bitterest foes³.

S. Basil’s great work—the *De Spiritu Sancto*—was written somewhat later⁴. His own account of its origin is the following. In offering the prayers

¹ *Eþ. lxxviii.*

² Dr Pusey thinks that he put forth a Eunomian Creed at a Synod held at Cyzicus, of which we have no further record. (*Councils*, p. 256.) He had become, in fact, a πρωτοστάτης τῆς τῶν Πνευματομάχων αἵρεσεως. (S. Basil. *Eþ. lxxiv.*)

⁴ He is described by Philostorgius (viii. 17. 1) as *τῷ πλήθει αἰδοῖός τε καὶ πιθανός*: a character which seems to have been common among the sect.

⁴ Probably in 374—5. *Vit. S. Basil.* ap. Migne.

of the Church, the Archbishop happened one day to repeat the Doxology in two different forms; on one occasion glorifying the Father διὰ τοῦ Τίον ἐν τῷ Ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι· on another, μετὰ τοῦ Τίον σὺν τῷ Ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι¹. Some person present attacked the latter of these forms as an innovation, and the interchange of the prepositions as involving doctrinal inconsistency. S. Basil saw through the complaint. “This hairsplitting about syllables and modes of speech is not so simple a matter as it seems; it conceals a deep and dark design upon our holy religion; it is veiled Anomœanism.” The real object of his adversaries’ malice was the doctrine of the Church, not the teacher: πίστις ἔστι τὸ πολεμούμενον². He meets the side-thrust with a full and serious investigation of the whole subject, maintaining the glorification of the Spirit with the Father and the Son, on the ground both of Scripture and of Catholic antiquity.

S. Amphilius, to whom this book is addressed, was himself a contributor to the literature of the doctrine. He is mentioned by S. Jerome, in his *Catalogue of Church writers*, as the author of a work on the Holy Spirit, which undertook to prove “that the Spirit is God, that He is to be adored, and that He possesses Almighty power³. ” This treatise is lost, but we have a letter under his name which appears to be the synodical Epistle of a Council over

¹ Philostorgius (iii. 13) ascribes the form δόξα Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ καὶ Πνεύματι Ἀγίῳ to Flavian of Antioch. Previously, he says, two other forms had been in use, δι' Υἱοῦ ἐν Ἀ. Πν., and ἐν Υἱῷ καὶ Ἀ. Πν. A fourth variation seems to have been καὶ Υἱῷ ἐν Ἀ. Πν. (Niceph. ix. 24.) Cf. Theodoret. ii. 19, and see Suicer, *Symb. Constantinop.* iii. p. 55. Hooker, *E. P.* v. xiii. 7. Bingham, xiv. 2.

² C. ii. 2 X

³ *Script. Eccles. Catal.* lxxxiii.

which as Bishop of Iconium he may have presided¹. The Synod mentions S. Basil with the profoundest respect, expressing its sorrow that bodily infirmity prevented him from being present and dictating the Epistle. It possessed however his σύγγραμμα περὶ ταύτης ἴδικῶς αὐτῷ τῆς ὑποθέσεως πεπονημένου, no doubt the book on the Spirit which he had already sent to S. Amphilochius. The contents of the letter are most interesting as showing that the general voice of the Church was beginning to call for some authoritative exposition of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit beyond the simple expression of belief in His Person with which the Creeds had hitherto been content. “We keep intact the Creed of Nicæa and pray that we may keep it to the end. But when that Creed was drawn up, it was necessary to dwell chiefly upon the glory of the Only Begotten: the question of the Spirit’s Deity had not yet been raised. Now, the times are changed: and though, for those who read it intelligently, the Nicene Faith is still sufficient, this fresh attack of the great Enemy renders a new investigation and defence of the doctrine indispensable².” The Synod grounds its faith in the Deity of the Holy Spirit, not on any development of doctrine which had been taking place in the living consciousness of the Church, but on the original

¹ Ap. Cotelerii *Eccles. Gr. Monumenta*, ii. 99. It is printed also by Thilo, *Bibl. Patr. Gr. Dogmatica*, ii. 631.

² πίστιν τὴν ἐκτεθεῖσαν υπὸ τῶν πατέρων τηνικαῦτα φυλάττομεν ἀκίνητον.....σεσιγγρέμενον δὲ τηνικαῦτα τοῦ κατὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα ζητήματος διὰ τούτο πλατύτερον μὲν οὐδὲν προσέθεσαν τοῖς μέντοι γε συνετῶς ἀναγινώσκουσιν αὐτάρκης καὶ ἡ περὶ τοῦ Πν. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ πίστει διδασκαλίᾳ.....ἐπεὶ δὲ πρόσφατον ὁ Σατανᾶς διασπαλεύει τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἐπιχειρῶν ἐνέβαλέ τις περὶ τον Πνεύματος δισταγμὸν ἀναγκάμον ἐπὶ τὴν πηγὴν ἀνατρέχειν τῆς πίστεως.

baptismal formula. The words of Baptism are declared to be *ἡ τοῦ Κυρίου παράδοσις, ἡ τῆς πίστεως τελειότης.* “If we separate the Holy Spirit from the GODHEAD, we make Him a creature. And if we venture to call Him a creature, how can we explain His being joined in Baptism with the Father and the Son?” The letter ends by claiming for the Holy Spirit the like place in the Doxology as for the other Persons of the Trinity : *ἐν ταῖς δοξολογίαις τὸ Πνεῦμα Πατρὶ καὶ Τίῳ [χρή] συνδοξάζειν.*

Another great light in the Church of Asia Minor at this time was S. Epiphanius, who was consecrated Metropolitan of Cyprus in 367.

In 373 his *Ancoratus* was written in answer to an appeal from the Catholic Presbyters of Suedra in Pamphylia. They ask for the learned Bishop’s assistance in refuting “the versatile heretics who were now abandoning their blasphemy against Jesus, and opening their mouths against the Holy Ghost.” Thousands, they say, had had their faith shaken : many of whom were now returning to the faith through the influence of S. Athanasius and others. Still the heresy lived on, and the Catholics needed to be protected against its assaults by a fuller exposition of their faith. Such an exposition they sought to obtain from Epiphanius : *παρακαλοῦμεν καταξιώσαι τὴν εὐλάβειάν σου...διὰ πλατυτέρου διηγήματος τὴν ὄρθην καὶ ὑγιῆ πίστιν ἐκθέσθαι.*

The Bishop appends to his answer two important Creeds, which he represents as expressing the faith of the whole Church, “our common Mother,” and which he desires may be taught to catechumens before their baptism¹. The first is nearly word for

¹ S. Epiph. *Ancor.* cxx.

word the Creed of Nicæa, but after the words *eis tò Πνεῦμα tò Ἀγιον* it exhibits the explanatory clauses which were adopted at Constantinople in 381. The second of the Epiphanian Creeds is in every way fuller, and on the doctrine of the Spirit particularly explicit. “We believe in Him (it says) on this wise: that He is the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God, the Perfect Spirit, the Spirit who is the Paraclete, Uncreate, proceeding from the FATHER and receiving from the Son, and the object of faith.” Then follows an anathema which extends the Nicene condemnation to those who apply to the Holy Spirit the terms originally applied by Arius to the Son¹.

Thus in the East, amid all her troubles, the Catholic Church was feeling her way to a re-issue of the Nicene Faith in an enlarged form. Her informal protest was raised against the new heresy as soon as it was proclaimed; and her earliest utterance on the question is as clear as the latest. Political obstructions alone held her back from an œcumencial decision during the lifetime of S. Basil or even of S. Athanasius. Her own mind was made up from the first; not even the words were wanting in which it was to be ultimately expressed.

The struggle was destined to end in that part of the Empire which had witnessed its beginning. Meanwhile, what was being done in Egypt and the West to assist the cause of orthodoxy?

At Alexandria, the death of S. Athanasius in 373

¹ καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἀγιον Πνεῦμα πιστεύομεν...οὗτως δὲ πιστεύομεν ἐν Αὐτῷ ὅτι ἔστι Πν. Ἀγ. Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ, Πνεῦμα τελέσιον Πνεῦμα παράκλητον, ἄκτιστον ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύομενον καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λαμβανόμενον [v. 1. λαμβάνοντα—cf. S. John xvi. 14] καὶ πιστεύομενον.....τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας ὅτι ἡν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἡν ὁ Υἱὸς ἡ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἀγιον κ.τ.λ. τούτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία ἡ μήτηρ ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν.

had been the signal for a fresh outbreak. Peter, the new Patriarch, was displaced by a violent Arian named Lucius, and found it necessary to take refuge at Rome, where he remained till Valens on the eve of his fatal expedition into Thrace permitted the return of exiled Catholic Bishops. One important work, however, in defence of the Holy Spirit's Deity was issued at Alexandria about this time. Didymus, master of the Catechetical school, a blind scholar whose intellectual faculties, like those of our own Milton, seem to have been quickened by the loss of bodily sight, wrote a treatise on the Holy Ghost, which his pupil S. Jerome afterwards translated into Latin. Jerome's version has been preserved, and forms a noble contribution from the suffering Church of Alexandria to the orthodox literature of the subject. Besides its independent value, this work of Didymus is of interest as having helped to mould the teaching of more than one of the great Western theologians: of S. Jerome himself, of S. Augustine¹, and in particular of S. Ambrose, whose own manual *On the Holy Spirit*, written in 381 for the use of the Emperor Gratian, is to a considerable extent an echo of the Alexandrian treatise². The zealous orthodoxy of Didymus was destined to atone for the hazy teaching of his great

¹ S. Augustine was acquainted with Didymus *De Spiritu*: see *Quæst. in Exod.* ii. 25.

² S. Jerome is severe upon S. Ambrose for copying Didymus, and says that the archbishop of Milan had produced "ex Græcis bonis Latina non bona." The work of the Latin Father is, however, by no means a mere copy: and other writers beside Didymus are laid under contribution in the argument; e.g. S. Basil and perhaps S. Athanasius. It was the wisdom of one who like S. Ambrose had been called to the episcopate from the business of a secular office, to draw in this way on the theological resources of more experienced controversialists.

predecessor Origen, and the Catechetical school added to its other distinctions the honour of producing an eminent defender of the Catholic Faith.

At Rome S. Damasus continued to take an active part in the controversy. We have seen how in 371 he assembled the Bishops of Italy and Gaul at the desire of S. Athanasius, to depose the Arian Auxentius. Another Synod was held in 378, at which Peter, the successor of S. Athanasius, was present. It condemned Apollinaris, whose heresy though principally affecting the Person of Christ seems to have developed itself into Macedonian error upon the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. According to S. Gregory of Nazianzus¹, Apollinaris gave the titles of Deity to the Holy Spirit, but denied Him the reality; *τὸ γὰρ ἐκ μεγάλου καὶ μείζονος καὶ μεγίστου συνιστᾶν τὴν Τριάδα...κλῖμαξ ἔστι θεότητος οὐκ εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀγονσα ἀλλ’ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατάγονσα.* Yet more important in its bearing on our present subject is the letter which this Roman Synod of 378 addressed to Paulinus of Tyre². It bristles with anathemas,—twenty-two in all—several of them distinctly levelled at the opponents of the Holy Spirit's Deity. Arius and Eunomius are condemned for maintaining that the Son and Spirit are creatures; and with them the Macedonians “qui de Arii stirpe venientes non perfidiam mutaverunt sed nomen.” The following extract will show the care with which the Western Church and especially the See of Rome at this time provided against every attack upon the Person of the Spirit. “Si quis non dixerit (1) semper...Spiritum sanctum esse (2) Sp. S. de Patre esse vere ac proprie (3) omnia posse Sp. S.,

¹ *Ad Cledon. Ep. i.*

² Mansi, *Conc. iii.* 486. Theodoret, v. 11.

omnia nosse, et ubique esse sicut et Patrem et Filium (4) Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti unam divinitatem potestatem majestatem potentiam, unam gloriam dominationem, unum regnum et unam voluntatem ac veritatem (5) tres Personas...veras, æquales (6) Spiritum Sanctum adorandum ab omni creatura...anathema sit." Again, "Si quis dixerit Spiritum Sanctum facturum aut per Filium factum anathema sit...Si quis de Patre et Filio bene senserit de Spiritu autem Sancto non recte habuerit, haereticus est." The whole is summed up in the weighty words, "Hæc est ergo salus Christianorum ut credentes Trinitati id est Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto et in eam baptizati veram solamque unam divinitatem potentiam majestatem et substantiam Ejus...sine dubio credamus."

The next year (379) saw the death of S. Basil. He lived to hear of the end of Valens, but not of the accession of the Catholic Emperor Theodosius, which took place within a month after his decease. It was given to another to lead the Church to conquest. The new champion was S. Gregory of Nazianzus, S. Basil's early friend. In the year that Basil entered into rest, Gregory was called from his retirement at Seleucia to take charge of the few Catholics who remained in Constantinople.

To Constantinople the scene is now shifted. For forty years this city had been wholly given to Arianism. The See had passed from Arian to Arian with scarcely any break: from Eusebius to Macedonius, from Macedonius to Eudoxius, from Eudoxius, in 370, to Demophilus, who held it till 380. Since 360, Homœan Arianism had been in power, but the Macedonians continued to hold their own in the neighbourhood, and the Eunomians also

regarded Constantinople as the head-quarters of their sect. To add to these complications, a Novatian Bishop taught the Catholic Faith at Constantinople, whilst he refused the communion of the Catholic Church. The Catholics proper were thus reduced to a mere remnant, without a Bishop, and latterly almost without a Priest, eighty of their clergy having been burnt alive at sea by order of Valens¹. They could hardly be called a congregation : οὐδὲ ποίμνιον ἀλλὰ ποίμνης τι μικρὸν ἵχνος ἢ λεύφανον, ἀσύντακτον καὶ ἀνεπίσκοπον καὶ ἀόριστον². Yet in this new charge Gregory saw an important field of labour³. He accepted the call, and assembled his little flock in the house of a Catholic. The great *basilica* which Imperial piety afterwards erected upon the spot was appropriately named Anastasia⁴: it was the scene of the revival, almost the resurrection of the Faith in Constantinople and throughout the East.

S. Gregory was received by the Arian majority with reproaches and insults. Stones were thrown at the Catholic Bishop as he passed along the streets. His presence in Constantinople, it was said⁵, was a disgrace to a city which had never been defiled by polytheistic worship. Nothing daunted, Gregory set forth the Nicene Faith in its

¹ Socr. iv. 16. Soz. vi. 14. Theod. iv. 24.

² S. Greg. *Or.* xxxii.

³ *Carm. de Vit. suâ.*

.....μικρὸν ζωτικῆς σπέρμα πνοῆς
ψυχᾶς τελείας τῷ λόγῳ τῆς πίστεως
λαὸν βραχὺν μέν, τῷ θεῷ δὲ πλείονα
ὅς οὐκ ἀριθμεῖ πλῆθος ἀλλὰ καρδίας.

⁴ Socr. v. 7.

⁵ *Carm. de Vit. suâ.*

.....ἔξεξετε καθ' ἡμῶν ἢ πόλις.
ώς εἰσαγόντων ἀνθ' ἐνὸς πλείους θεούς.

fulness : five *Theological Orations* remain as a monument at once of his eloquence and of his fidelity¹. The last of these orations deals expressly with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit². On this question he encountered the combined opposition of all the Arian schools. Some who heard him patiently when he preached the Deity of the Son, asked, when the Bishop proceeded to speak of GOD³ the Holy Ghost, Πόθεν ἡμῶν ἐπεισάγεις ξένον θεὸν καὶ ἄγραφον; The time was past, however, for withholding from the Holy Spirit the titles of Godhead. In S. Basil's day, prudence and charity might have justified reserve : now, matters were ripe for a full proclamation of the truth, and nothing was to be gained by ignoring the consequences of the Catholic doctrine. Gregory also declined to take shelter under the figures of speech which had been usual even among the orthodox ; illustrations of the Trinity drawn from natural objects appeared to him to break down under calm consideration. He fell back upon a plain and unadorned statement of the Faith, urging his hearers to exchange speculation for adoration, curiosity for practical godliness. He assured them that as a Catholic Bishop his own aim would simply be to promote the worship of the Divine Trinity in Unity—τοὺς ἄλλους πείθεν εἰς δύναμιν προσκυνεῖν Πατέρα καὶ Τίὸν καὶ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, τὴν μίαν θεότητά τε καὶ δύναμιν.

Preaching like S. Gregory's, eloquent, outspoken, and devout, could not fail to make way even in

¹ Oratt. xxxiii—xxxvii. [=xxvii—xxxii.]

² "De Sancto Spiritu liber unus." Hieron. *Script. Catalog.* cxvii. Probably this oration, after delivery, was published by S. Gregory in a separate form, and so reached S. Jerome.

³ See e. g. the passage cited at the head of this chapter.

the city of Arianism. The spiritual workman who was wanting to build up the walls of the ruined Church had at length been found. Meanwhile the external triumph of Catholicism was at hand. In the spring of 380, Theodosius, who had now received Catholic baptism, issued his first edict in support of the orthodox faith. It was addressed “*Ad Populum Urbis Constantinopolitanæ*,” and must have fallen like a thunder-clap on the enemies of Gregory. “We will (so runs the document) that all peoples who are under our rule observe the religion which S. Peter delivered to the Roman Church and which is now held by Damasus of Rome and Peter of Alexandria: namely, that according to Apostolical rule and Evangelical doctrine, we believe in One GODHEAD of the Father Son and Holy Ghost, of like majesty, a Unity in Trinity¹.” It goes on to direct that the name of Catholic Christians is to be henceforth given exclusively to those who hold this Faith; recusants are to be regarded in the light of heretics, their assemblies are not to be considered as Churches; and finally, it is not obscurely hinted that they will be visited hereafter with the

¹ *Codex Theodos. XVI. i. 2 (De fide Catholica).* Cunctos populos quos Clementiæ nostræ regit temperamentum in tali volumus religione versari quam Petrum Apostolum tradidisse Romanis religio usque nunc ab ipso insinuata declarat, quamque Pontificem Damasum sequi claret et Petrum Alexandriæ Episcopum virum Apostolicæ sanctitatis: ut secundum Apostolicam disciplinam Evangelicamque doctrinam, Patris et Filii et Spiritus S. unam deitatem sub parili majestate et sub piâ Trinitate credamus. Hanc legem sequentes Christianorum Catholicorum nomen jubemus amplecti; reliquos vero dementes vesonque judicantes hæretici dogmatis infamiam sustinere, nec Conciliabula eorum Ecclesias nomen accipere, Divinâ primum vindictâ post etiam motus nostri quam ex cœlesti arbitrio sumpserimus ultione plectendos. Dat. iii Kal. Mart. Thessal. Gratiano V. et Theodosio I. AA. Coss.

displeasure of the Emperor in some more material form.

Late in the year Theodosius took a further step. The Arian Bishop of Constantinople was required to sign the Nicene Faith. With more than ordinary frankness he refused, and retired from the city. S. Gregory was then formally put into possession of the Church of S. Sophia.

A second edict followed in January 381, which extends to the whole of the East the principles already asserted in the capital¹. All the churches and sees are to be restored to the Catholics. Heretics may not hold their assemblies within the towns. The Eunomians are handled in this decree with peculiar severity; and in a clause which is evidently aimed at the Pneumatomachi, a confession of the Holy Spirit's Deity is declared to be one of the requisite marks of adherence to the Nicene Faith and the Catholic Church.

The new Emperor, if not tolerant, was sincerely orthodox². Not content to repress heresy by the strong arm of Imperial power, he was eager to re-establish the Faith in the hearts of his subjects.

¹ *Cod. Theodos.* XVI. i. 6. Arceantur cunctorum hæreticorum ab inlicitis congregationibus turbæ...Ariani sacrilegii venenum, Eunomiæ [fors. Eunomianæ] perfidiae crimen...ab ipso etiam aboleantur auditu. Is autem Nicænæ adscitos fidei et Catholicæ religionis verus cultor accipiens est...qui Spiritum Sanctum, a quo id quod ex summo rerum Parente speramus accipimus, negando non violat....

² Theodosius had been brought up in the Nicene Faith, and was little accustomed to the speculative controversies which distracted the Eastern Church. Under these circumstances it could hardly have been expected that he would shew much forbearance towards the countless heretical sects by which, as Emperor of the East, he suddenly found himself surrounded. Yet his zeal was not unmixed with charity: οὐκ ἐπεξῆγει, οὐ γὰρ τιμωρεῖσθαι ἀλλ' εἰς δέος καθιστᾶν τοὺς ὑπηκόους ἐσπούδαζεν, ὅπως ὁμόφρονες αὐτῷ γένοντο περὶ τὸ θεῖον. ἐπεὶ τοὺς ἔκοπτὶ μετατιθεμένους ἐπήγει. (Sozom. vii. 12.)

Statesmanship was not equal to this more difficult task. It required the experience of theologians who had been foremost in grappling with the heretical doctrines : the collective wisdom and authority of the Bishops of the Church could alone supply what was wanting to define and protect the truth which had been attacked. Theodosius saw this clearly, and summoned a synod of the whole Eastern Church. It met at Constantinople early in the summer of 381. The city which had long been the stronghold of Arian unbelief was fitly chosen to be the scene of its final defeat.

CHAPTER IV.

THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

“In Sancti Spiritus memoratione adimpletur mysterium Trinitatis.”
Rufin. *in Symb. Comm.* 35.

“Ista Trinitas Unus DEUS, una natura, una substantia, una potentia,
summa æqualitas, nulla divisio, nulla diversitas, perpetua charitas.”
S. Augustin. *Serm. ad Catech.* 13.

THE Council of Constantinople owes its œcumenicity to the agreement of its doctrinal decisions with the mind of the Universal Church. In the stricter sense of the word the Council certainly was not œcumenical, for the West was unrepresented. Nicephorus distinctly states that Theodosius, as Emperor of the East, summoned only the Bishops of the East: *σύνοδον ἐπισκόπων ἐς ταῦτο συνελθεῖν ἐκάλει ἐκ μόνης τῆς ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἀρχομένης*¹. A glance at the signatures appended to the Constantinopolitan Canons confirms this statement. Of some hundred and fifty names² scarcely one belongs to the Western Church. Even the Patriarch of Alexandria was

¹ Niceph. Callist. xii. 10. So Theodoret (v. 7): *μόνης τῆς οἰκείας βασιλείας τοὺς ἐπισκόπους συναθροισθῆναι προσέταξεν.*

² 147 in our present list. Some authorities give 166; others 180. See Tillemont, *Mémoires*, ix. 471. Without assuming the complete trustworthiness of the list as it stands in the *Concilia*, it may be inferred from the absence of western names that the West was slightly if at all represented. Ascholius (or Acholius) of Thessalonica appears to have been in fact the solitary exception: Socr. v. 8. Mansi, *Concil.* iii. 632.

not originally invited to the Synod, and took but little part in its proceedings. The Roman Bishop did not appear either in person or by legates. S. Meletius, who seems to have presided at the earlier sittings, was not in communion with the See of Rome, which acknowledged Paulinus as Patriarch of Antioch¹. Nearly three-fifths of the subscribing bishops came from Asia Minor; of the remainder, more than half belonged to Syria and the adjacent countries.

Nor was the Council oecumenical in the sense of its decrees finding acceptance as a whole with the Church of the age in which it was held. On the contrary, the third Constantinopolitan Canon, which gave precedence to the See of Constantinople next after the See of Rome, was rejected by Pope after Pope². Timothy of Alexandria also naturally refused to acquiesce in the degradation of his own Church. Another act of the Council failed to gain the consent of the West. It had deposed Maximus 'the Cynic' on the ground that his consecration was invalid, electing S. Gregory to the vacant throne of Constantinople and, upon his resignation, Nectarius. In a letter to Theodosius put forth by an Italian Council of 381 the Bishops of the West protest against these arrangements, and actually appeal from the judgment of the Constantinopolitan Fathers to a true general Council, an assembly both of East and West, which they propose to hold at Rome³.

¹ Pusey, *Councils*, p. 306.

² Cf. e.g. Leo Magn. *Eph.* 53. It was not acknowledged at Rome till the time of Innocent III. Bright, *History of the Church*, p. 178.

³ They say, "Nec videmus eam (sc. communionem) posse aliter convenire nisi aut is (Maximus) reddatur Constantinopoli qui prior est ordinatus, aut certe super duorum ordinatione sit in urbe Româ

Yet on re-assembling at Constantinople in 382, the Bishops of the East seem to have been in nowise staggered by these facts. They declined, courteously but firmly, the invitation to Rome, and in a synodical letter to Damasus they claimed oecumenicity for their own synod of the previous year¹. It is to be observed however that the claim is made in reference to the Council's confirmation of the orthodox faith. Thus limited, it involved a practical truth which in course of time the whole Church tacitly acknowledged. The decisions of Constantinople on points of doctrine were but the re-assertion of principles already settled at the strictly Ecumenical Council of Nicæa. Moreover, they expressed the actual judgment of the then existing Catholic Church. The West had already set forth its doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the synods held under Damasus in 371 and 378². It remained for the East to speak. In the East the question had arisen. Asia Minor, Syria, above all Constantinople and the Hellespont, had been the chief scenes of the conflict: and it was the orthodox Episcopate of the Eastern Church which had borne the burden and heat of the day. To the East³, therefore, and to the Church of Constantinople in particular, it belonged to proclaim

nostrum Orientaliumque Concilium." Further, they even contrast the Constantinopolitan Synod with such a truly Ecumenical meeting: "At eo ipso tempore qui generale concilium declinaverunt, Constanti-nopoli quæ gessisse dicuntur?" Cf. *Vales. Adnotat.* in Theodoret. v. 9.

¹ Theodt. v. 9. [τόμῳ] τῷ πέρυσιν ἐν Κωνσταντινούπολει παρὰ τῆς οἰκουμενικῆς ἐκτιθέντι συνόδου.

² The 5th Canon of Constantinople appeals to the Synodical Epistle which the second of these Italian Councils addressed to Paulinus of Antioch, if it be right to identify that letter with the "tome of the Westerns" to which the Constantinopolitans refer.

³ Theodoret. v. 6. αὗτη γὰρ μόνη [the East] τῆς Ἀραιανῆς ἐνεπέ-
πληστο λαβῆσ· ή γὰρ ἐσπέρα τῆς νόσου ταύτης ἀλευθέρα διέμεινε.

the victory of the truth. The Constantinopolitan Creed is the symbol of the return of the East to a faith which the West never lost; and the œcumenicity of its confession has given to an Eastern Synod a place among the First Four General Councils of the Church. It is not equally clear how soon its œcumenical character was acknowledged. Photius says that Damasus himself expressed his assent to its doctrinal decisions¹. S. Gregory the Great, without accepting its Canons as such, acknowledges its definitions of Faith²: “Romana Ecclesia eosdem Canones vel gesta Synodi illius hactenus non habet nec accepit; in hoc autem eam accepit quod est per eam contra Macedonios definitum.” In another well-known passage he declares in the strongest terms his personal conviction of the Council’s authority as an exponent of doctrine³: “Sicut Sancti Evangelii libros, sic quatuor Concilia suscipere et venerari me fateor... Nicænum scilicet... Constantinopolitanum quoque in quo Eunomii et Macedonii error convinxitur.”

Thus we are justified in regarding the dogmatic language of the Second General Council as the voice of the Universal Church. With a primary view to Eastern controversies, yet in strict accordance with Western belief and with the traditional Creed, the Council of Constantinople enunciated once for all the Catholic doctrine of the Deity of the Holy Ghost.

In assembling the Synod, the Emperor made an earnest effort to include the bishops of the Macedonian party⁴, whom he believed to differ but

¹ *Eph.* i. 8. οὐ πολὺς χρόνος καὶ Δάμασος ὁ τῆς Ρώμης τὰ αὐτὰ κρατύνων ἐγνωρίζετο σύμφωνος.

² *Eph.* vii. 34.

³ *Eph.* i. 24.

⁴ *Socr.* v. 8. *Sozom.* vii. 7.

slightly from the orthodox¹. His invitation was accepted by thirty-six Semiarian prelates², headed by Eleusius of Cyzicus. But the negotiations broke down as soon as it was discovered that the majority of the Council would support the Nicene Faith. In vain the Macedonians were pressed with their own acceptance of the ὁμοούσιον on occasion of the Lampsacene deputation to Liberius; they ignored the proceedings of 366, and refused to meet the Catholics on the basis of the profession which they had then deliberately made. Not content themselves to withdraw from the Council, they wrote letters to other members of the party, charging them on no account to assent to the Creed of Nicaea. They even declared that rather than join the Homousiasts they would fall back into the arms of their deadly enemies the strict Arians, *i.e.* the Eudoxians and Eunomians³. It was too plain that conciliatory measures were useless. The Macedonians were further from the Catholic Church than the Emperor, unskilled in the controversies of the East, had fondly supposed—further than fifteen years before it would have seemed possible for them to be.

Of the Bishops who remained, many were men of large experience and well-earned distinction. There were S. Gregory of Nazianzus, and S. Gregory of Nyssa, the friend and the brother of S. Basil—representatives, as it may have seemed, of that great champion of the Faith whose own course had been finished before the moment of victory arrived. There was S. Cyril of Jerusalem, the

¹ ὡς μὴ περὶ μέγα τι διαφερομένους ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὸ δύγμα ζητήσει (Sotom. vii. 7).

² Most of these, Socrates adds, were from the Hellespont.

³ Socr. v. 8. μᾶλλον ἔφασαν τὴν Ἀρειανὴν αἰρεῖσθαι ὁμολογεῖν δόξαν ἢ τῷ ὁμοούσιῳ συντίθεσθαι.

author of the *Catechetical Lectures*, now finally parted from his Semiarian friends¹. There was S. Meletius of Antioch, who when the Arians stopped his mouth as he was preaching the Trinity, held up three fingers first, and then one alone, in silent testimony to the truth. There was S. Amphilochius of Iconium, who had already led a synod of his own diocese to the defence of the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Ghost. Nicæa itself had scarcely produced an assembly more competent to deal with a fundamental question of the Faith.

Of the seven Canons which are commonly attributed to the Second General Council, three only

¹ It is difficult to fix the exact position of S. Cyril in reference to the Semiarian party. His life—extending from 315 to 386—coincided with the period during which the battle between Catholicism and Arianism was fought out. In his younger days his sympathies seem to have been with the Church: he received ordination from two Catholic Bishops, and his *Catechetical Lectures*, delivered in 347 when he was still a Presbyter, give no uncertain sound as to the Deity of the Word and of the Holy Ghost. After his elevation to the Episcopate a personal dispute with Acacius threw him into the company of Semiarians, and in 359—60 we find him acquitted by the Semiarian Council of Seleucia, and condemned, together with several Semiarian Bishops, by the Acacian Synod of Constantinople. A Cyril is mentioned among the Semiarians whom Liberius addressed in 366; but there is reason to doubt his identity with the Bishop of Jerusalem (*Vit. Cyrill.* ap. Migne, p. 102—3). Sozomen (iv. 25) distinctly states that S. Cyril lay under suspicion of Semiarian proclivities—*τοῖς ὄμοιούσιοις τῷ Πατρὶ τὸν Υἱὸν εἰσηγουμένους ἐπόμενος*. Both Socrates and Sozomen represent his presence at the Council of Constantinople in 381 as a virtual recantation (Socr. v. 8. *τότε ἐκ μεταμελείας τῷ ὄμοοντιώ προσκείμενος*: Sozom. vii. 7. *μεταμεληθεὶς τότε ὅτι πρότερον τὰ Μακεδονίον ἐφράνει*). It may at least be taken as a proof that his former connection with the Macedonian party was due to the force of circumstances rather than to any true sympathy with the heresy of the Pneumatomachi. S. Athanasius (*De Syn.* 41) speaks of some who were Catholics at heart, though unable to accept the language of the Church. It is possible that this was at one time the position of Cyril, and that he abandoned it upon discovering the impossibility of occupying middle ground between Arianism and the Nicene Faith.

are connected with the subject of this essay¹. Two of these are of doubtful genuineness. The fifth Canon² is thought to belong in strictness to the re-assembled Council of 382. It acknowledges the orthodox at Antioch who confessed "the One God-head of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit," and refers to a certain "tome of the Westerns," which appears to be either the letter addressed to Paulinus by the Roman synod of 378³, or the earlier letter of 371⁴. The seventh Canon is a statement of fact rather than a Church-law, and appears to have been appended to the original records of the Council as illustrative of the practice of the later Church in dealing with the heretics whom the Council had condemned⁵. Arians and Macedonians, it declares, might be restored to communion by the simple use of chrism, which was sufficient to supply the defects of a valid but heretical baptism. Eunomians, on the other hand, were required to pass through the various stages by which converts from paganism gained admission into the Body of Christ⁶.

¹ *I.e.* Canons i. v. vii.

² Canon v. περὶ τοῦ τόμου τῶν Δυτικῶν καὶ τοὺς ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ ἀπεδεξάμεθα τοὺς μίαν ὁμολογοῦντας Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος θεότητα.

³ *Suhr.* p. 72.

⁴ *Suhr.* pp. 56—7.

⁵ Cf. Routh, *Ortho.* i. 422 seq.

⁶ The 7th Canon runs: Τοὺς προστιθεμένους τῇ ὁρθοδοξίᾳ καὶ τῇ μερίδι τῶν σωζομένων ἀπὸ αἱρετικῶν δεχόμεθα κατὰ τὴν ὑποτεταγμένην ἀκολουθίαν καὶ συντίθειαν. Ἀρειανὸς μὲν καὶ Μακεδονιανούς...δεχόμεθα διδόντας λεβέλλους καὶ ἀναθεματίζοντας πᾶσαν αἵρεσιν μὴ φρονῦσσαν ὡς φρονεῖ ἡ ἄγια τοῦ Θεοῦ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία, καὶ σφραγιζομένους ἡτοι χριομένους...καὶ σφραγίζοντες αὐτοὺς λέγομεν 'Σφραγὶς δωρεᾶς Πνεύματος Ἁγίου.' Εὐνομιανὸς μέντοι τοὺς εἰς μίαν κατάδυσιν βαπτίζομένους...ὡς Ἑλληνας δεχόμεθα, κ.τ.λ. With regard to the last clause cf. Sosom. vi. 26. καὶ περὶ τὴν θείαν βάπτισιν ἐνεωτέρισταν οὐκ εἰς Τριάδα ἀλλὰ εἰς τὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ θάνατον βαπτίζεσθαι εἰσηγησάμενος. To baptize by one immersion was παραχαράξαι τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων εἰσέτι νῦν ἐν πᾶσι φυλαττομένην παράδοσιν. By the Apostolical Canons (XLIX=L) it is for,

But the all-important Canon is the First, and that this is a genuine relic of the Council of 381 there can be no doubt. It enacts :

μὴ ἀθετέσθαι τὴν πίστιν τῶν πατέρων τῶν τριακοσίων δεκαοκτὸν τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ τῆς Βιθυνίας συνελθόντων, ἀλλὰ μένει ἐκείνην κυρίαν καὶ ἀναθεματισθῆναι πᾶσαν αἵρεσιν καὶ ἴδικῶς τὴν τῶν Εὐνομιανῶν εἴτουν Ἀνομοίων καὶ τὴν τῶν Ἀρειανῶν εἴτουν Εὔδοξιανῶν καὶ τὴν τῶν Ἡμιαρειάνων ἥγουν Πνευματομάχων· καὶ τὴν τῶν Σαβελλιανῶν καὶ τὴν τῶν Μαρκελλιανῶν καὶ τὴν τῶν Φωτεινιανῶν καὶ τὴν τῶν Ἀπολλυμαριστῶν.

This Canon, it will be observed, fulfils a double purpose. It (1) re-affirms the Faith of Nicæa, and (2) pronounces a synodical condemnation on the latest development of the Arian heresy. The text of the Canon shows how completely that development had been espoused by the Semiarian school. The party who at first were distinguished from Catholics by the introduction of a single letter into the *όμοούσιον*, had become identical with the opponents of the Holy Spirit's Deity. Henceforth we find writers on heresy recognizing no difference between Semiarians or Macedonians¹ and Pneuma-

bidden on pain of deposition. Epiphanius gives a somewhat different account of Eunomian baptism : *ἀναβαπτίζει [ό Ευνόμιος] τὸν ηδη βαπτισθέντας εἰς όνομα Θεοῦ ἀκτίστου καὶ εἰς όνομα Υἱοῦ κεκτισμένου καὶ εἰς όνομα Πνεύματος ἀγιαστικοῦ καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ κεκτισμένου Υἱοῦ κτισθέντος.* If this was the form of words he employed, the rejection of *trine* immersion can only be explained on the ground of antagonism to the Church. Epiphanius says that this antagonism was further shown by their baptizing *κατὰ κεφαλῆς*.

¹ The word 'Macedonians' does not occur in the Canon. This is the more singular as the Anomœans and Homœan Arians are designated by the names of their respective chiefs. Perhaps it was felt that the recovery of some at least among the Macedonian bishops was not yet hopeless. After their deliberate withdrawal from the Council it might have been expected that the sect would be anathematized by name ; and the absence of such anathema is certainly a sign that the

tomachì. S. Epiphanius had been careful to draw the line between the former of these sects and the latter; but from 381 the last trace of this boundary disappears.

The Constantinopolitan Creed finds no place in the Canons of the Council¹, which simply endorse the Faith of the Three Hundred and Eighteen². Nor is it expressly mentioned in the brief synodical letter to Theodosius, unless included in the “concise definitions” by which the Fathers claim to have guarded the Nicene doctrine against the inroads of recent heresy³. A more probable reference to the revised Creed is to be found in the letter addressed to Damasus in 382 by such of the bishops as were then again assembled at Constantinople. They speak of “the tome which was put forth by the Council of the previous year⁴;” and it has been supposed⁵, with a fair amount of probability, that this document contained both Canons and Creed. Yet the latter does not occur in any extant record earlier than the year 451, when it was produced and read at Chalcedon⁶. The Council of Ephesus (431) not only ignored the revision altogether, but expressly forbade any person

Catholic majority were swayed by a tolerant and charitable spirit. The Macedonians are mentioned in Can. vii., but see p. 85.

¹ In the *Concilia* it occurs after the 7th Canon, but as a detached form with a separate heading (*τὸ ἐκτεθὲν παρὰ τῆς αὐτῆς συνόδου τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινούπολει σύμβολον*).

² *Canon i.* (cited above).

³ ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ συντόμους ὅρους ἔξεφωνήσαμεν, τὴν τε τῶν πατέρων πίστιν τὴν ἐν Νικαίᾳ κυρώσαντες καὶ τὰς κατ' αὐτῆς ἐκφυέσας αἱρέσεις ἀναθεματίσαντες. Mansi, *Conc. iii.* 557.

⁴ τόμῳ τῷ πέρυσι ἐν Κωνσταντινούπολει...ἐκτεθέντι. *Infr.* p. 95.

⁵ By Tillemont, after Usher; *Mémoires*, ix. 494. Cf. Hefele, *Conc. Geschichte*, ii. 9.

⁶ The Fathers of Chalcedon say, ‘Ορίζομεν...προλάμπειν μὲν...τὴν ἐκθεσιν τῶν τιή...κρατεῖν δὲ καὶ τὰ παρὰ τῶν ρύ. ἀγίων πατέρων ἐν Κωνσταντινούπολει ὄρισθέντα.

"to produce, write, or compose any other Creed than that which was put forth by the Fathers of Nicæa under the guidance of the Holy Spirit¹." As the Ephesine Synod could scarcely have intended to condemn an act of the Constantinopolitan, we are compelled to seek an explanation in one of the two following alternatives². Either the revised Creed of Constantinople, although approved by the Council of 381, obtained but a partial or merely local circulation, and was unknown to the Ephesine Fathers even after a lapse of fifty years³. Or the Constantinopolitan Creed was regarded simply in the light of a re-issue of the Nicene, and the additional clauses as a true and legitimate gloss upon the original text. The Symbol of Constantinople was in fact the Symbol of Nicæa: it cleared up the ambiguities of the earlier document, but changed nothing. So that in accepting the Nicene Faith, the Fathers of Ephesus virtually acknowledged the Constantinopolitan; for the two Creeds are substantially one⁴. This view gains some confirmation from the careful language in which the Council of Chalcedon explains

¹ μηδένι ἔξειναι προφέρειν ἥγουν συγγράφειν ἢ συντιθέναι παρὰ τὴν ὁρισθείσαν παρὰ τῶν ἀγίων πατέρων τῶν ἐν τῇ Νικαέων συναθέντων πόλει σὺν Ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι.

² It is assumed that the Council of Chalcedon was not in error as to its facts, when it ascribed the enlarged Creed to the Council of Constantinople. Cf. Stanley, *Eastern Church*, p. 174, "The additions which now appear in that Creed (the Dean is arguing for 'the finality of the Nicene Creed') and which are commonly ascribed to the Fathers of Constantinople...did probably then make their appearance."

³ To this view Mr Lumby seems to incline in his recent *History of the Creeds* (published while these sheets were passing through the press), pp. 68—83.

⁴ Cf. Suicer, *Symb. Constantinopol.* i. 15, 16. "Veteres.. .utrumque Symbolum pro uno habuerunt. Quidquid apposuit...Constantinopolitanum, id δυνάμει, h. e., potentia sive virtute inest Nicæno."

that the Creed of the One Hundred and Fifty did not exceed the doctrinal limits laid down by the Three Hundred and Eighteen. The words are worth quoting¹: [Η παροῦσα σύνοδος] διὰ μὲν τὸν τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἀγίῳ μαχομένους τὴν χρόνοις ὑστερον παρὰ τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλευούσης πόλεως συνελθόντων ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα ἀγίων πατέρων περὶ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος οὐσίας παραδοθεῖσαν διδασκαλίαν κυροῦ, ἦν ἔκεινοι τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐγνώρισαν οὐκ ᾥς τι λεῖπον τοῖς προλαβοῦσιν ἐπάγοντες, ἀλλὰ τὴν περὶ τοῦ Ἀ. Πνεύματος αὐτῶν ἔννοιαν κατὰ τῶν τὴν Αὐτοῦ δεσποτείαν ἀθετεῖν πειρωμένων γραφικαῖς μαρτυρίαις τρανώσαντες. It may well have been this consciousness of the real identity of the earlier and later symbols, coupled with a desire to maintain the continuity and oneness of the Catholic faith, which kept the Church from distinguishing at first between the forms issued by the First and Second General Councils. When Socrates and Sozomen represent the Second Council as confirming the Faith of the First², their language need not be construed into a denial of the fact that the Second General Council sanctioned an expansion of the Nicene Creed on that particular article of the Faith which had been attacked.

The new paragraphs on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit are attributed by Nicephorus³ to S. Gregory of Nyssa: τὴν τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος δόξαν ᾧ ἴστοιμον καὶ ὅμοδοξον τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Τίῷ τῷ θείῳ συμβόλω τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ πίστεως προστείθεσαν, τοῦ Νύστης Γρηγορίου τὸ λεῖπον τῷ ἱερῷ συμβόλω ἀναπληρώσαντος. On the other hand, at the

¹ Mansi, *Conc. vii. 114.*

² Socr. v. 8 ἐβεβαίωσάν τε αὐθις τὴν ἐν Νικαίᾳ πίστιν. Sozom. vii. 9 ἐψηφίσαστο τῆς ἐν Ν. συνόδου κυρίαν μένειν τὴν πίστιν. The reference is to *Canon i.*

³ Niceph. xii. 13.

Council of Florence the clauses were said to have been the work of S. Gregory Nazianzen¹—a mere correction of the statement of Nicephorus, or an error of memory. Both accounts are certainly wrong, if it be intended to credit either Gregory with the authorship of the words. The friend or the brother of S. Basil might have suggested the adoption of this particular form; but the words themselves are earlier. We have seen that they occur in one of the Creeds which S. Epiphanius cited in his *Ancoratus*, some eight years before the date of the Council². The Council of Nicæa had fallen back upon the traditional language of the Church, adopting an ancient Palestinian Creed³ as the basis of its own. The Council of Constantinople, following in the steps of its predecessor, expounded the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the words of an existing Confession. It was the wisdom of the Ancient Church to avoid even the appearance of innovation in matters of faith.

The explanatory clauses which the Second General Council appears to have more or less directly authorized were few and simple, but sufficient. The Nicene Fathers had said, [Πιστεύομεν] καὶ εἰς τὸ ὄντα Πνεῦμα. The Fathers of Constantinople continued, τὸ κύριον τὸ ζωοποιὸν⁴ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπο-

¹ Cf. Hefele, *Conc.-Geschichte*, ii. 9. The words used at Florence were these: τοῦ συμβόλου τούτου Γρηγόριος ὁ μέγας ἦν συγγραφεύς, ὡς φασιν, οὐ τὸ ἐπώνυμον ἐκ τῆς θεολογίας ἀπονεμῆται.

² *Ancor.* cxx. *Supr.* p. 70.

³ Socr. i. 8. Cf. Stanley, *Eastern Ch.* 155, seq.

⁴ *Act. Conc. Chalc.* ii. τὸ Κύριον καὶ τὸ ζωοποιόν. *Ibid.* v. τὸ Κ. καὶ ζωοποιόν. The Epiphanian Creed gives Κ. καὶ ζ. In the Latin versions we have “Dominum et vivificantem;” “D. et vivificatorem.” Cf. Hahn, p. 111–116, and Heurtley, *Harm. Symb.* p. 160.

ΡΕΓΥΜΕΝΟΝ Τὸ Σὺν ΠΑΤΡὶ καὶ Γίῳ ΣΥΜΠΡΟΣΚΥΝΟΥΜΕΝΟΝ καὶ ΣΥΝΔΟΖΑΖΟΜΕΝΟΝ Τὸ ΛΑΛΗΣΑΝ Διὰ Τῶν ΠΡΟΦΗΤῶΝ¹.

Three things are worthy of notice in the definition thus introduced into the Creed. (1) It is expressed almost entirely in the words of Holy Scripture. Τὸ Κύριον is an echo of S. Paul's, “οὐδὲ Κύριος τὸ Πνεῦμα ἔστι².” Τὸ ζωοποιόν is a reminiscence of Our Lord's words in S. John, “τὸ Πνεῦμα ἔστι τὸ ζωοποιοῦν³.” Τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον⁴ recalls “οὐ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται.” That it was the Holy Ghost who spake by the Prophets is asserted continually in the Gospels and in the Epistles: by the Apostles and by Christ Himself. That He is to be adored and glorified in union with the Father and the Son is fairly inferred from the words of Baptism, from the Apostolical Benediction, and from the general tone of the New Testament. Even the Old Testament has its Trisagion, in which the Seraphim are represented as glorifying the Three in One... (2) The moderation of the Creed is remarkable. Although composed exclusively of orthodox bishops, led by

¹ The Constantinopolitan form (after the Epiphalian) also inserts in the definition of the Incarnation, [Σαρκωθέντα] ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἄγιον καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου. Cf. *Act. Conc. Chalc.* (*Mansi*, vii. 111) οἱ γὰρ ἄγιοι πατέρες οἱ μετὰ τὰῦτα τὸ ‘ἐσαρκώθη’ οὐ εἰπον οἱ ἄγιοι οἱ ἐν Ν. πατέρες ἐσαφήνισαν εἰπόντες ‘ἐκ Πν. “Α. κ.τ.λ.”’ The clause seems to be chiefly directed against Apollinarian views (*Pusey, Councils*, p. 313); but its insertion may be due in part to the desire of setting forth the creative power of the Holy Ghost.

² 2 Cor. iii. 17. On the exegesis of the passage, see Liddon, *Univ. Sermons*, pp. 63—4; and on the other hand, Pearson, Art. viii. (i. 375), Wordsworth, i. l. Cf. Suicer, *Symb. Constantinoꝝ*. pp. 117—8.

³ S. John vi. 63 (cf. v. 21): 2 Cor. iii. 6, τὸ Πν. ζωοποιεῖ: Rom. viii. 2, τὸ Πν. τῆς ζωῆς. The Spirit is also described in Church writers as ζωαρχικόν, i.e. ἡ ἀρχὴ s. αἴτια τῆς ζωῆς: Suicer, *Thes.* s.v.

⁴ S. John xv. 26. Questions connected with the further expansion of this clause do not fall within the limits of this essay.

such uncompromising Catholics as S. Gregory, S. Meletius, and S. Amphilochius, and meeting under the protection of an Emperor who had already announced his adhesion to the doctrine of the ὁμοούσιον, the Council abstained from formally applying to the Person of the Holy Spirit a term so obnoxious to some who at heart were loyal to the truth which it expressed. That truth was secured by His being declared One in glory with the Father and the Son: and the purpose of the Council was to protect the Faith, not to celebrate a victory¹. With a meekness of wisdom worthy of S. Basil or of S. Paul himself, the Fathers of Constantinople refrained even from defining the Holy Ghost to be God. It was enough that the fact of His Godhead was involved in the Divine worship which He was declared worthy to receive... (3) Notwithstanding the absence of technical language, every word which occurs in the Constantinopolitan definition dealt a death-blow to some aspect of the Eunomian and Macedonian heresies. The heretics described the Spirit of God as λειτουργικόν, διακονικόν. In their systems He filled the place of a Servant of the Supreme God: He was ὑπηρέτης, even δοῦλος Θεοῦ². The Creed, as expanded, replies that He is τὸ Κύριον [Πνεῦμα], Divinely sovereign and supreme, as are the Father and the Son. Again, the Anomœans

¹ The Catholics desired reunion, if it could be had otherwise than at the expense of truth: οὐ γὰρ νικῆσαι ζητοῦμεν ἀλλὰ προσλαβεῖν ἀθελφοὺς ὅν τῷ χωρισμῷ σπαρασσόμεθα. Greg. Naz. *Or.* xliv. According to Photius the healing of the Macedonian schism was the object which Theodosius had at heart in summoning the Council of 381. (*Biblioth. cclvii.*)

² Cf. Phot. *Eph.* i. 8. Sozom. iv. 27. vi. 22. ἀμφότεροι [Anomœans and Macedonians] διακονικὸν τὸ Πν. ἴσχυρίζοντο. S. Chrysostom, commenting on Rom. viii. 2, asks Πῶς αὐτὸς δοῦλον δὲ ἀλευθεροῖ; Cf. S. Basil. *Eph.* cxli.

and some of the Pneumatomachi were never weary of asserting that the Holy Spirit was the creature of the created Son: an ἔργον, κτίσμα, δημιούργημα, even an ἔργον ἔργου, a κτίσμα κτίσματος¹. The Creed of Constantinople simply but effectually meets this blasphemy by the assertion that He is Himself the Giver of Life. No ποίημα can be ζωοποιόν; the Spirit is². It is added, in our Lord's own words, that the Spirit proceeds from the Father: for such procession evidently excludes the theory of His creation by the Son³. Once more, the Eunomians and Pneumatomachi refused to offer to the Holy Ghost the adoration which they rendered to the Father, and which the latter for the most part were willing to render to the Son. We have seen how S. Basil was encountered by this refusal, when he recited the Catholic doxology merely as an alternative to the less dogmatic form⁴. The Constantinopolitan Creed re-asserts S. Basil's position: the Holy Ghost is to be adored and glorified in the Unity of the Blessed Trinity. It is worthy of note that in this, the strongest of the defining clauses, the Deity of the Holy Ghost is represented as necessarily involved in the worship of the Church, rather than as a theological dogma. Heresy had at length compelled the Church to define: but the Church still remembered that the end of her existence is to adore⁵. Moreover, she knew well that no more effectual barrier to the progress of these

¹ S. Epiph. *hær.* lxxvi.

² S. Ath. *ad Serap.* i. 23. τὸ δὲ μὴ μετέχον ζωῆς ἀλλ' αὐτὸ μετεχόμενον καὶ ζωοποιοῦν τὰ κτίσματα ποίων ἔχει συγγένειαν πρὸς τὰ γενητά;

³ "Sp. S....non factus nec creatus...sed procedens" (*Fid. S. Ath.*). Cf. S. Basil. *adv. Eunom.* v. οὐκ ἐν χρόνῳ πρόεισι τὸ προῖόν ἐκ Θεοῦ. See Neander, *Ch. H.* iv. 87.

⁴ *Supr.* pp. 66—7.

⁵ Cf. *supr.* pp. 8, 9.

irreligious sects could be devised than the simple but authoritative statement which claims for the Holy Spirit the worship due to GOD Alone¹.

On July 30, 381 a fresh edict of the Emperor Theodosius² ratified the decision of the Council by placing all the Churches throughout the Empire in the hands of the Bishops who acknowledged the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Trinity. The leading members of the Catholic Episcopate are mentioned by name : to be in communion with them was to be henceforth regarded as a test of communion with the Church. Those who rejected their communion were to be treated as heretics and expelled from the Churches. It is added that this stringent rule was rendered necessary by the tergiversations of heretics, who had hitherto contrived to evade the vigilance of the law³. The edict was addressed to the Pro-consul of Asia, since Asia Minor had been the nursery of the Macedonian heresy, and continued to be its principal stronghold.

If the definitions of the Council could have left any doubt as to the belief of the Eastern Bishops in the consubstantial Deity of the Holy Ghost, it must have been set at rest by the letter which was

¹ The last of the Epiphanian clauses—τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν—seems to have been retained as an ancient testimony to one of the great and truly Divine operations of the Spirit. Cf. Usher, *De Symb.* (*Works*, vii. 321).

² *Cod. Theodos.* xvi. “Episcopis tradi omnes Ecclesias mox jubemus qui unius majestatis atque virtutis Patrem et Filium et Spiritum S. confitentur, ejusdem gloriae, claritatis unius; nihil dissonum profanâ divisione facientes sed Trinitatis ordinem Personarum adassertiōnem et Divinitatis unitatem.” Among the Bishops named in the edict are Nectarius, Timothy, Diodorus of Tarsus, S. Amphilius, and S. Gregory of Nyssa.

³ “Nec post evidenter præcepti nostri formam malignæ locus detur astutiæ.”

addressed to the Bishops of the West by such of the Fathers as were able to re-assemble in the following year (382)¹. The letter forms in fact an authoritative commentary on the Nicene Creed in its enlarged form. This Creed, the Bishops say, teaches Christians to believe in the Name of the Father the Son and the Holy Ghost, δηλαδὴ θεότητός τε καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ οὐσίας μᾶς...πιστευομένης, ὁμοίου τε τῆς ἀξίας καὶ συναϊδίου τῆς βασιλείας ἐν τρισὶ τελειωτάταις ὑποστάσεσιν ἡτούν τρισὶ τελείοις προσώποις· ὡς μήτε τὴν Σαβελλίου νόσον χώραν λαβεῖν...μήτε τὴν τῶν Εὐνομιανῶν καὶ Ἀρειανῶν καὶ Πνευματομάχων βλασφημίαν ἴσχυεν, τῆς οὐσίας ἢ τῆς φύσεως ἢ τῆς θεότητος τεμνομένης, καὶ τῇ ἀκτίστῳ καὶ ὁμοουσίῳ καὶ συναϊδίῳ Τριάδι μεταγενεστέρας τινὸς ἢ κτιστῆς ἢ ἔτερον οὐσίου φύσεως ἐπαγομένης. It is obvious that the moderation and simplicity which characterize the synodical definitions of 381² are not to be attributed to weakness or indecision.

The leniency of the Council stands in marked contrast to the sternness of the Emperor. It has been remarked that Theodosius “in the course of fifteen years (A. D. 380—394) published fifteen decrees against heretics or those who were not of his own creed³.” They were forbidden to hold assemblies in town or country, to celebrate the

¹ Theodoret. v. 9.

² These definitions—including possibly the Canon and the Creed—are thus referred to by the Council of 382: περὶ ὅν [sc. τῶν κατὰ τὴν πίστιν] ἐπὶ πλέον ψυχαγωγηθῆναι δυνήσεσθε, τῷ τε ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τόμῳ παρὰ τῆς ἐκεὶ συνελθούσης συνόδῳ γεγενημένῳ καταξιώσαντες ἐντυχεῖν καὶ τῷ πέρυσι ἐν Κωνσταντινοπόλει παρὰ τῆς οἰκουμενικῆς ἐκτεθέντι συνόδου· ἐν οἷς πλατύτερον τὴν πίστιν ὀμολογήσαμεν καὶ τῶν ἔναγχος καινοτομηθεισῶν αἱρέσεων ἀναθεματισμὸν ἔγγραφον πεποίηκαμεν. On τῷ πέρυσι ἐκτεθέντι τόμῳ see above, p. 87. The Council of Antioch seems to be that of the year 378. Baronius, 378, § xliv.

³ Smith's *Dict. Biogr.* iii. p. 1065. Cf. *Cod. Theodos.* xvi. v. 6—23.

mysteries, to ordain bishops or priests. Yet it is fair to add that even after the Council of Constantinople the Emperor made one earnest attempt to reconcile to the Church the various Arian sects. It appears that the expulsion of the heretical clergy from the church-buildings led to outbreaks of popular feeling in every part of the Empire¹. The Emperor was distressed rather than irritated or alarmed. He sent for the Patriarch Nectarius, and with a simplicity which does him credit enquired whether any plan could be devised for healing the dissensions of Christendom². He assembled a conference of the leaders of all Christian bodies, orthodox and heretical. They met at Constantinople in 383. Each party presented its confession to the Emperor by the hands of its representative head. Nectarius appeared on behalf of the Church : Agelius for the Novatians : Demophilus the late Bishop of Constantinople for the pure Arians (*i. e.* the Eudoxians) : Eleusius for the Macedonians : the Eunomians were represented by Eunomius himself. Theodosius took their papers and withdrew to the silence of his oratory. There he perused them, after fervently praying that God would enable him to discern the truth. Two only commended themselves to his judgment—the confessions of the Novatian and Catholic Bishops. The rest proclaimed a divided Trinity: the ὁμοούσιον alone guarded the sacred truth of the Unity. This result convinced the Emperor that the difficulties in the way of reconciliation were insuperable. The Semiarian watchword might differ from that of the Catholics by only a

¹ Socr. v. 10. Sozom. vii. 12.

² τίς ἀν γένοιτο μηχανὴ δπως ἀν μὴ διαφωνοί δ Χριστιανισμός. Socr. v. 10.

single letter: but in that letter lay concealed a denial of the true and proper Godhead both of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

From that moment the heresy of the Pneumatomachi found place only without the Church. The Council by its spiritual weapons, the Emperor by a vigorous yet not wholly unmerciful use of the secular power, delivered the Church once and for ever from the presence of this treacherous enemy within her walls: ἐκθερίσαντες τέλεον (as Photius says), καὶ εἴτι τῆς Ἀρειανῶν σπόρας ζυζάνιον ὑπεφύετο¹. It may be doubted whether the justice of the Theodosian edicts is equal to their vigour and to the zeal on behalf of the Catholic faith which they display. But upon the great synod which defined the doctrine of the Church concerning the Person of the Holy Ghost, no such reflection can be cast. S. Gregory of Nazianzus tells us indeed that he had lived long enough to despair of seeing any good result from an assembly of bishops; and he makes no exception in favour of the Constantinopolitan Council². The spirit of contention and self-assertion had been rife even amongst the Fathers of Eastern Christendom. Doubtless his witness is true. But amidst these elements of human weakness it is possible to discern the workings of a Divine Strength³. There is neither folly nor profanity in the belief that the Second General Council was guided by the Spirit

¹ Phot. *Eph.* i. 8.

² *Eph.* lv. ἔχω μὲν οὕτως (εἰ δεῖ τὰληθὲς γράφειν) ὥστε πάντα σύλλογαν φεύγειν ἐπισκόπων ὅτι μηδεμιᾶς συνόδου τέλος είδον χρηστόν.

³ What Sozomen says of another decision of this Council may without hesitation be said of that which confirmed the Nicene Faith: πειθόμαί γε μήν οὐκ ἐκτὸς θείας ρωπῆς ἐπιτελεσθῆναι τὸ συμβάν. (Sozom. vii. 8.)

of Truth to define for all future ages of the Church the true doctrine concerning Himself.

The history of the struggle which was brought to an end in 381 is thus eloquently summed up by the author of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*¹. “It was not long [after the Nicene Council] ere Macedonius transferred unto God’s most Holy Spirit the same blasphemy wherewith Arius had already dishonoured His co-eternally begotten Son : not long ere Apollinarus began to pare away from Christ’s Humanity. In refutation of which impieties when the Fathers of the Church, Athanasius Basil and the two Gregories, had by their painful travails sufficiently cleared the truth, no less for the Deity of the Holy Ghost than for the complete Humanity of Christ, there followed here-upon a final conclusion whereby those controversies, as also the rest which Paulus Samosatenus, Sabellius, Photinus, *Ætius*, Eunomius, together with the whole swarm of pestilent Demi-Arians had from time to time stirred up sithence the Council of Nice, were both privately first at Rome in a smaller synod, and then at Constantinople in a general famous assembly, brought to a peaceable and quiet end, seven-score Bishops and ten agreeing in that confession which by them set down remaineth at this present hour a part of our Church Liturgy, a memorial of their fidelity and zeal, a sovereign preservative of God’s people from the venomous infection of heresy.”

¹ *E. P.* v. lii. 1.

τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ πρέπει δόξα τιμὴ καὶ προσκύνησις σὺν
τῷ συνανάρχῳ αὐτοῦ ἕιώ καὶ λόγῳ ἀλλα τῷ παναγίῳ καὶ ζωο-
ποιῷ πνεύματι, οὖν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀτελεγτήτους αἰῶνας τῶν
αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

Cambridge :
PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

CAMBRIDGE, 1873.

LIST OF WORKS

PUBLISHED BY

MESSRS. DEIGHTON, BELL, & CO.

Agents to the University,

AND GEORGE BELL AND SONS, LONDON.

ALFORD (DEAN) The Greek Testament: with a critically revised Text; a Digest of Various Readings; Marginal References to Verbal and Idiomatic Usage; Prolegomena; and a Critical and Exegetical Commentary. For the use of Theological Students and Ministers. By the late HENRY ALFORD, D.D., Dean of Canterbury.

Vol. I. *Sixth Edition*, containing the Four Gospels. 1*l.* 8*s.*

Vol. II. *Sixth Edition*, containing the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians. 1*l.* 4*s.*

Vol. III. *Sixth Edition*, containing the Epistle to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians,—to Timotheus, Titus, and Philemon. 1*s.*

Vol. IV. Part I. *Fourth Edition*, containing the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Catholic Epistles of St. James and St. Peter. 1*s.*

Vol. IV. Part II. *Fourth Edition*, containing the Epistles of St. John and St. Jude, and the Revelation. 1*s.*

The Greek Testament. With English Notes, intended for the Upper Forms of Schools and Pass-men at the Universities. By HENRY ALFORD, D.D. Abridged by BRADLEY H. ALFORD, M.A., late Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge. One vol., crown 8vo. 10*s. 6d.*

The New Testament for English Readers. Containing the Authorised Version, with additional corrections of Readings and Renderings; Marginal References; and a Critical and Explanatory Commentary. By HENRY ALFORD, D.D. In two volumes.

Vol. I. Part I. Containing the First Three Gospels. *Second Edition.* 1*l.* 2*s.*

Vol. I. Part II. Containing St. John and the Acts. *Second Edition.* 10*s. 6d.*

Vol. II. Part I. Containing the Epistles of St. Paul. *Second Edit.* 1*s.*

Vol. II. Part II. Containing the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Catholic Epistles, and the Revelation. *Second Edition.* 1*s.*

Eastertide Sermons, preached before the University of Cambridge, on Four Sundays after Easter, 1866. By HENRY ALFORD, D.D. Small 8vo. 3*s. 6d.*

A Plea for the Queen's English; Stray Notes on Speaking and Spelling. By HENRY ALFORD, D.D. Small 8vo. *Tenth Thousand.* 5*s.*

Letters from Abroad.
By HENRY ALFORD, D.D. Small 8vo. 7*s. 6d.*

BANISTER (H. C.) Text Book of Music, with Exercises in Harmony and Counterpoint, specially adapted for Candidates for the Local Examinations. Small 8vo. 5s.

BARRETT (A. C.) Companion to the Greek Testament. For the use of Theological Students and the Upper Forms in Schools. By A. C. BARRETT, M.A., Caius College; Author of "A Treatise on Mechanics and Hydrostatics." *New Edition, enlarged and improved.* Fcap. 8vo. 5s.

This volume will be found useful for all classes of Students who require a clear epitome of Biblical knowledge. It gives in a condensed form a large amount of information on the Text, Language, Geography, and Archaeology; it discusses the alleged contradictions of the New Testament and the disputed quotations from the Old; and contains introductions to the separate books. It may be used by all intelligent students of the sacred volume; and has been found of great value to the students of Training Colleges in preparing for their examinations.

BEAMONT (W. J.) A Concise Grammar of the Arabic Language. Revised by SHEIKE ALI NADY EL BARRY. By W. J. BEAMONT, M.A. Price 7s.

BENSON (E. W.) Work, Friendship, Worship. Three Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge in October and November, 1871. By E. W. BENSON, D.D., Master of Wellington College; late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Lincoln. Small 8vo. 2s. 6d.

BLUNT (J. J.) Five Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge. The first Four in November, 1851, the Fifth on Thursday, March 8th, 1849, being the Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. By J. J. BLUNT, B.D., formerly Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

CONTENTS : 1. Tests of the Truth of Revelation.—2. On Unfaithfulness to the Reformation.—3. On the Union of Church and State.—4. An Apology for the Prayer-Book.—5. Means and Method of National Reform.

BONNEY (T. G.) Death and Life in Nations and Men. Four Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, in April, 1868. By T. G. BONNEY, B.D., Fellow of St. John's College. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

BONWICKE (AMBROSE), Life of, by his father. Edited by JOHN E. B. MAYOR, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. Small 8vo. 6s.

BROWNE (B.P.) Messiah as Foretold and Expected. A Course of Sermons relating to the Messiah, as interpreted before the Coming of Christ. Preached before the University of Cambridge in the months of February and March, 1862. By the Right Reverend E. HAROLD BROWNE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Ely. 8vo. 4s.

BURN (R.) *Rome and the Campagna. An Historical and Topographical Description of the Site, Buildings and Neighbourhood of Ancient Rome.* By R. BURN, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge. With Eighty-five Engravings by JEWITT, and Twenty-five Maps and Plans. 4to. cloth. £3. 3s.

The purpose of this work is to furnish students of the History and Literature of Rome with a description of the chief features of the site and buildings of the city during the regal, republican, and imperial eras, with a view especially to illustrate the writings of the principal Latin historians and poets. In the Introduction a sketch is given of the more prominent developments of ancient Roman architecture, and the illustrations they afford of Roman national character. Complete Indices are added of all the subjects discussed and of all passages quoted from classical authors, and also a list of modern works on Roman topography and antiquities.

CALVERLEY (C. S.) *Verses and Translations.* *Fourth Edit.* Fcap. 8vo. 5s.

————— Translations into English and Latin. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

————— Theocritus translated into English Verse. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

————— Fly Leaves. *Fifth Edit.* Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY CALENDAR, 1873. 6s. 6d.

CAMPION (W. M.) *Nature and Grace. Sermons preached in the Chapel Royal, Whitehall, in the year 1662-3-4.* By WILLIAM MAGAN CAMPION, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of Queens' College, Cambridge, Rector of St. Botolph's, Cambridge, and one of her Majesty's Preachers at Whitehall. Small 8vo. 6s. 6d.

CANONESS (The). *A Tale in verse of the Time of the First French Revolution.* Small 8vo. 5s.

CATALOGUE of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge. By T. H. AUFRECHT, Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in the University of Edinburgh. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

CATALOGUE of the Arabic, Persian, and Turkish Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge. By E. H. PALMER, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. With an Appendix containing a Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan MSS. in the same Library. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

CHALLIS (J.) *A Translation of the Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Romans, with an Introduction and Critical Notes.* By J. CHALLIS, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, and Plumian Professor of Astronomy in the University of Cambridge. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

COOPER (C. H. and THOMPSON). *Athenae Cantabrigienses.* By C. H. COOPER, F.S.A., and THOMPSON COOPER, F.S.A.

Volume I. 1500—1585. 8vo. cloth. 18s. Volume II. 1586—1609. 18s.

LIST OF WORKS PUBLISHED BY

DENMAN (G.) *The First Book of Pope's Homer's Iliad.*
Translated into Latin Elegiacs. By Hon. GEORGE DENMAN, M.A., formerly Fellow and Auditor of Trinity College, now one of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas. 3s. 6d.

DONALDSON (J. W.) *The Theatre of the Greeks.* A Treatise on the History and Exhibition of the Greek Drama: with various Supplements. By J. W. DONALDSON, D.D., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. *Seventh Edition*, revised, enlarged, and in part remodelled; with numerous illustrations from the best ancient authorities. 8vo. 14s.

Classical Scholarship and Classical Learning considered with especial reference to Competitive Tests and University Teaching. A Practical Essay on Liberal Education. By J. W. DONALDSON, D.D. Crown 8vo. 5s.

ELLIS (A. A.) *Bentleii Critica Sacra.* Notes on the Greek and Latin Text of the New Testament, extracted from the Bentley MSS. in Trinity College Library. With the Abbé Rulotta's Collation of the Vatican MS., a specimen of Bentley's intended Edition, and an account of all his Collations. Edited, with the permission of the Masters and Seniors, by A. A. ELLIS, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

ELLIS (ROBERT LESLIE). *The Mathematical and other Writings of ROBERT LESLIE ELLIS, M.A.*, formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Edited by WILLIAM WALTON, M.A., Trinity College, with a Biographical Memoir by the Very Reverend HARVEY GOODWIN, D.D., Dean of Ely. Portrait. 8vo. 16s.

EWALD (H.) *Life of Jesus Christ.* By H. EWALD. Edited by OCTAVIUS GLOVER, B.D., Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo. 9s.

The Prophet Isaiah. Chapters I—XXXIII. From the German of H. EWALD. By OCTAVIUS GLOVER, B.D. Crown 8vo. 6s.

FAMILY PRAYERS from or in the Style of the Liturgy; with Occasional Prayers and Thanksgiving. By DR. HAMMOND, Bishop ANDREWES, and others. Crown 8vo. 3s.

FULLER (J. M.) *Essay on the Authenticity of the Book of Daniel.* By the REV. J. M. FULLER, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. 8vo. 6s.

FURIOSO, or, Passages from the Life of LUDWIG VON BEETHOVEN. From the German. Crown 8vo. 6s.

GLOVER (O.) *A Short Treatise on Sin, based on the Work of Julius Müller.* By O. GLOVER, B.D., Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Doctrine of the Person of Christ, an Historical Sketch. By OCTAVIUS GLOVER, B.D., Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo. 3s.

GOODWIN (H., D.D., Lord Bishop of Carlisle). *Doctrines and Difficulties of the Christian Religion contemplated from the Standing-point afforded by the Catholic Doctrine of the Being of our Lord Jesus Christ. Being the Hulsean Lectures for the year 1855.* By H. GOODWIN, D.D. 8vo. 9s.

— ‘The Glory of the Only Begotten of the Father seen in the Manhood of Christ.’ Being the Hulsean Lectures for the year 1856. By H. GOODWIN, D.D. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

— Essays on the Pentateuch. By H. GOODWIN, D.D. Fcap. 8vo. 5s.

— Parish Sermons. By H. GOODWIN, D.D. 1st Series. *Third Edition.* 12mo. 6s.

— 2nd Series. *Third Edition.* 12mo. 6s.

— 3rd Series. *Third Edition.* 12mo. 7s.

— 4th Series. 12mo. 7s.

— 5th Series. With Preface on Sermons and Sermon Writing. 7s.

— Four Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge in February, 1869. I. Parties in the Church of England. II. Use and Abuse of Liberty in the Church of England. III. The Message of the Spirit to the Church of England. IV. Discussions concerning the Holy Communion in the Church of England. By H. GOODWIN, D.D. Small 8vo. 4s.

— Four Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge in the Season of Advent, 1858. By H. GOODWIN, D.D. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

— Christ in the Wilderness. Four Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge in the month of February, 1855. By H. GOODWIN, D.D. 12mo. 4s.

— Lectures upon the Church Catechism. By H. GOODWIN, D.D. 12mo. 4s.

— A Guide to the Parish Church. By H. GOODWIN, D.D. Price 1s. *sewed;* 1s. 6d. *cloth.*

— Confirmation Day. Being a Book of Instruction for Young Persons how they ought to spend that solemn day, on which they renew the Vows of their Baptism, and are confirmed by the Bishop with prayer and the laying on of hands. By H. GOODWIN, D.D. *Eighth Thousand.* 2d., or 2s for 3s. 6d.

— Plain Thoughts concerning the meaning of Holy Baptism. By H. GOODWIN, D.D. *Second Edition.* 2d., or 2s for 3s. 6d.

— The Worthy Communicant; or, ‘Who may come to the Supper of the Lord?’ By H. GOODWIN, D.D. *Second Edition.* 2d., or 2s for 3s. 6d.

— The Doom of Sin, and the Inspiration of the Bible. Two Sermons preached in Ely Cathedral: with some Prefatory Remarks upon the Oxford Declaration. By H. GOODWIN, D.D. Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

GOODWIN (Bp.). Hands, Head, and Heart; or the Christian Religion regarded Practically, Intellectually, and devotionally. In Three Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge. By H. GOODWIN, D.D. Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

— The Ministry of Christ in the Church of England. Four Sermons Preached before the University of Cambridge. I.—The Minister called. II.—The Minister as Prophet. III.—The Minister as Priest. IV.—The Minister Tried and Comforted. By H. GOODWIN, D.D. Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

— The Appearing of Jesus Christ. A short Treatise by SYMON PATRICK, D.D., formerly Lord Bishop of Ely, now published for the first time from the Original MS. Edited by H. GOODWIN, D.D. 18mo. 3s.

— Commentaries on the Gospels, intended for the English Reader, and adapted either for Domestic or Private Use. By H. GOODWIN, D.D. Crown 8vo.

S. MATTHEW, 12s. S. MARK, 7s. 6d. S. LUKE, 9s.

— On the Imitation of Christ. A New Translation. By H. GOODWIN, D.D. *Third Edition.* With fine Steel Engraving, after GUIDO, 5s.; without the Engraving, 3s. 6d. Cheap Edition, 1s. cloth, 6d. sewed.

GRADUATI Cantabrigienses: sive Catalogus Exhibens Nomina eorum quos ab Anno Academico Admissionum mccc usque ad Decimum Diem Octobris mccccclxxii gradu quoque ornavit Academia Cantabrigiensis, e Libris Subscriptionum Desumptus. Cura HENRICI RICHARDIS LUARD, A.M., Coll. SS. Trin. Socii atque Academico Registrarii. 8vo. cloth. 10s.

GROTE (J.) Exploratio Philosophica. Rough Notes on Modern Intellectual Science. Part I. By the late J. GROTE, B.D., Fellow of Trinity College and Professor of Moral Philosophy at Cambridge. 8vo. 9s.

— An Examination of the Utilitarian Philosophy, by the late JOHN GROTE, B.D. Edited by JOSEPH B. MAYOR, M.A., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. 8vo. 12s.

— Sermons by the late JOHN GROTE, B.D. Fcap. 8vo. 5s.

— Aretaics and Eudaemonics, a Theory of Virtue and Happiness. By the late JOHN GROTE, B.D. [In the Press.]

HARDWICK (C. H.). History of the Articles of Religion. To which is added a series of Documents from A.D. 1536 to A.D. 1615. Together with illustrations from contemporary sources. By the late CHARLES HARDWICK, B.D., Archdeacon of Ely. *Second Edition, corrected and enlarged.* 8vo. 12s.

HUMPHRY (W. G.) An Historical and Explanatory Treatise on the Book of Common Prayer. By W. G. HUMPHRY, B.D., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. *Third Edition, revised and enlarged.* Small post 8vo. 4s. 6d.

— The New Table of Lessons Explained, with the Table of Lessons and a Tabular Comparison of the Old and New Proper Lessons for Sundays and Holy-days. By W. G. HUMPHRY, B.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Vicar of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, Westminster. Fcap. 1s. 6d.

KENT's Commentary on International Law. Revised, with Notes and Cases brought down to the present year. Edited by J. T. ARDY, LL.D., Regius Professor of Laws in the University of Cambridge. 8vo. 16s.

LEAPINGWELL (G.) Manual of the Roman Civil Law, arranged according to the Syllabus of Dr. HALLIFAX. By G. LEAPINGWELL, LL.D. Designed for the use of Students in the Universities and Inns of Court. 8vo. 12s.

LATHAM (P. W.) On the Symptomatic Treatment of Cholera with especial reference to the importance of the Intestinal Lesion. By Dr. FELIX VON NIEMEYER, Professor of Pathology and Therapeutics, etc., in the University of Tübingen. Translated from the German by P. W. LATHAM, M.A., M.D., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, London, late Fellow of Downing College, Cambridge. Small 8vo. 2s. 6d.

On Nervous or Sick-Headache: its Varieties and Treatment. *Plates.* Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.

LEATHES (STANLEY). The Birthday of Christ, its Preparation, Message, and Witness. Three Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, in December, 1865. By STANLEY LEATHES, M.A., Preacher and Assistant Minister, St. James's, Piccadilly, Professor of Hebrew, King's College, London. Fcap. 8vo. 2s.

LEVIN (T. W.) "Six Lectures Introductory to the Philosophical Writings of Cicero." With some Explanatory Notes on the subject-matter of the Academics and De Finibus. By T. W. LEVIN, M.A., St. Catharine's College, Inter-Collegiate Lecturer on Logic and Moral Philosophy. 1 vol. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

LOBLEY (J.) The Church and the Churches in Southern India. A Review of the Portuguese Missions to that part of the world in the Sixteenth Century, with special reference to the Syrian Christians, and to modern Missionary efforts in the same quarter. The Maitland Prize Essay for 1870. By JOSEPH ALBERT LOBLEY, M.A., Vicar of Hamer, Rochdale, formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 8vo. 4s.

LUMBY (J. RAWSON). The Ancient Creeds and the Confessions in the Sixteenth Century with special reference to the Articles of the Church of England. By J. RAWSON LUMBY, Tyrwhitt's Hebrew Scholar, Crosse Divinity Scholar, Classical Lecturer of Queens', and late Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge. [In the Press.

MACKENZIE (BISHOP), Memoir of the late. By the DEAN OF ELY. With Maps, Illustrations, and an Engraved Portrait from a painting by G. RICHMOND. Dedicated by permission to the Lord Bishop of Oxford. Second Edition. Small 8vo. 6s.
The Large Paper Edition may still be had, price 10s. 6d.

MACMICHAEL (W. F.) The Oxford and Cambridge Boat Races. A Chronicle of the Contests on the Thames in which University Crews have borne a part from A.D. 1829 to A.D. 1869. Compiled from the University Club Books and other Contemporary and Authentic Records, with Maps of the Racing Courses, Index of Names, and an Introduction on Rowing and its value as an Art and Recreation. By W. F. MACMICHAEL, B.A., Downing College, Secretary C.U.B.C. Fcap. 8vo. 6s.

MASKEW (T. R.) Annotations on the Acts of the Apostles. Original and selected. Designed principally for the use of Candidates for the Ordinary B.A. Degree, Students for Holy Orders, &c., with College and Senate-House Examination Papers. By T. R. MASKEW, M.A. *Second Edition, enlarged.* 12mo. 5s.

MILL (W. H.) Observations on the attempted Application of Pantheistic Principles to the Theory and Historic Criticism of the Gospels. By W. H. MILL, D.D., formerly Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge. *Second Edition, with the Author's latest notes and additions.* Edited by his Son-in-Law, the Rev. B. WEBB, M.A. 8vo. 14s.

— Lectures on the Catechism. Delivered in the Parish Church of Brasted, in the Diocese of Canterbury. By W. H. MILL, D.D. Edited by the Rev. B. WEBB, M.A. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

— Sermons preached in Lent 1845, and on several former occasions, before the University of Cambridge. By W. H. MILL, D.D. 8vo. 12s.

— Four Sermons preached before the University on the Fifth of November and the three Sundays preceding Advent, in the year 1848. By W. H. MILL, D.D. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

— An Analysis of the Exposition of the Creed, written by the Right Reverend Father in God, J. PEARSON, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Chester. Compiled, with some additional matter occasionally interspersed, for the use of Students of Bishop's College, Calcutta. By W. H. MILL, D.D. *Third Edition, revised and corrected.* 8vo. 5s.

FIVE SERMONS ON THE TEMPTATION OF CHRIST.

— Our Lord in the Wilderness. Preached before the University of Cambridge in Lent, 1844. By WILLIAM HODGE MILL, D.D., F.R.A.S., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. *Second Edition,* Edited by his Son-in-Law, the Rev. BENJAMIN WEBB, M.A., F.S.A., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Wells-street, St. Marylebone. 8vo. cloth. 6s.

MOULE (H. C. G.) Poems on Subjects selected from the Acts of the Apostles; with other Miscellaneous Pieces. By H. C. G. MOULE, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Fcap. 8vo. 4s.

NEWTON (SIR ISAAC) and Professor Cotes, Correspondence of, including Letters of other Eminent Men, now first published from the originals in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge; together with an Appendix containing other unpublished Letters and Papers by Newton; with Notes, Synoptical View of the Philosopher's Life, and a variety of details illustrative of his history. Edited by the Rev. J. EDLESTON, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 8vo. 10s.

PALMER (E. H.) The Desert of the Exodus. Journeys on Foot in the Wilderness of the Forty Years' Wanderings, undertaken in connection with the Ordnance Survey of Sinai and the Palestine Exploration Fund. By E. H. PALMER, M.A., Lord Almoner's Professor of Arabic and Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, Member of the Asiatic Society, and of the Société de Paris. With Maps, and numerous Illustrations from Photographs and Drawings taken on the spot by the Sinai Survey Expedition and C. F. TYRWHITT DRAKE. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

— Oriental Mysticism. A Treatise on the Sufiistic and Unitarian Theosophy of the Persians. Compiled from Native Sources by E. H. PALMER. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

PALMER (E. H.) A Descriptive Catalogue of Arabic, Persian, and Turkish Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge. By E. H. PALMER. With an Appendix containing a Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan MSS. in the same Library. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

PEARSON (J. B.) Creed or No Creed. Three Sermons Preached before the University of Cambridge, in October, 1871, by J. B. PEARSON, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Hulsean Lecturer, and Vicar of Horningsea, Cambridgeshire. Small 8vo. 2s. 6d.

PEROWNE (J. J. S.) Immortality. Four Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge. Being the Hulsean Lectures for 1868. By J. J. S. PEROWNE, B.D., Vice-Principal and Professor of Hebrew in St. David's College, Lampeter. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

PEROWNE (E. H.) The Godhead of Jesus; being the Hulsean Lectures for 1866; to which are added Two Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge on Good Friday and Easter Day, 1866. By E. H. PEROWNE, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Hulsean Lecturer, formerly one of her Majesty's Preachers at the Chapel Royal, Whitehall. 8vo. 5s.

PIEROTTI (EMETE). Jerusalem Explored: being a Description of the Ancient and Modern City, with upwards of One Hundred Illustrations, consisting of Views, Ground-plans, and Sections. By EMETE PIEROTTI, Doctor of Mathematics, Captain of the Corps of Engineers in the army of Sardinia, Architect-Engineer to his Excellency Soorsaya Pasha of Jerusalem, and Architect of the Holy Land. Translated and edited by T. G. BONNEY, B.D., St. John's College. 2 vols. imperial 4to. 5l. 5s.

PHILLIPS (GEO.) Short Sermons on Old Testament Messianic Texts, preached in the Chapel of Queens' College, Cambridge. By GEO. PHILLIPS, D.D., President of the College. 8vo. 5s.

A Syriac Grammar. By the Rev. G. PHILLIPS, D.D., President of Queens' College. *Third Edition, revised and enlarged.* 8vo. 7s. 6d.

PRITCHARD (C.) Analogies in the Progress of Nature and Grace. Four Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, being the Hulsean Lectures for 1867; to which are added Two Sermons preached before the British Association. By C. PRITCHARD, M.A., President of the Royal Astronomical Society, late Fellow of S. John's College. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

PRYME (G.) Autobiographic Recollections of George Pryme, Esq., M.A., sometime Fellow of Trinity College, Professor of Political Economy in the University of Cambridge, and M.P. for the Borough. Edited by his Daughter, A. BAYNE. 8vo. 12s.

PSALTER (The) or Psalms of David in English Verse. With Preface and Notes. By a Member of the University of Cambridge. Dedicated by permission to the Lord Bishop of Ely, and the Reverend the Professors of Divinity in that University. 5s.

RUST (J. C.) The Revelation of Saint John compared with other Apocalyptic Writings. 8vo. 2s.

SCHOLEFIELD (PROF.) Hints for some Improvements in the Authorised Version of the New Testament. By J. SCHOLEFIELD, M.A., formerly Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge. *Fourth Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 4s.

SCOTT (G. G.) *The Argument for the Intellectual Character of the First Cause as it is Affected by the more Recent Investigations of Physical Science.* Being the Burney Prize Essay for the year 'CLO'1900' LXVIII. By GEORGE GILBERT SCOTT, jun., B.A., F.S.A., of Jesus College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

SCRIVENER (F. H.) *Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament.* With 40 Facsimiles from Ancient Manuscripts. For the Use of Biblical Students. By F. H. SCRIVENER, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge. 8vo. 1s.

— *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis.* Edited, with Prolegomena, Notes, and Facsimiles. By F. H. SCRIVENER, M.A. 4to. 26s.

— *A Full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus with the Received Text of the New Testament; to which is prefixed a Critical Introduction.* By F. H. SCRIVENER, M.A. *Second Edition, revised.* Fcap. 8vo. 5s.

"Mr. Scrivener has now placed the results of Tischendorf's discovery within the reach of all in a charming little volume, which ought to form a companion to the Greek Testament in the Library of every Biblical student."—*Reader.*

— *An Exact Transcript of the CODEX AUGIENSIS, Graeco-Latina Manuscript in Uncial Letters of S. Paul's Epistles, preserved in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge.* To which is added a Full Collation of Fifty Manuscripts containing various portions of the Greek New Testament deposited in English Libraries: with a full Critical Introduction. By F. H. SCRIVENER, M.A. Royal 8vo. 28s.

The CRITICAL INTRODUCTION is issued separately, price 5s.

— *Novum Testamentum Graecum, Textus Stephani, 1550. Accedunt variae lectiones editionem Beze, Elzeviri, Lachmanni, Tischendorfi, et Tregellesii.* Curante F. H. SCRIVENER, M.A. 16mo. 4s. 6d.

This Edition embodies all the readings of Tregelles and of Tischendorf's Eighth or latest Editions to Corinthians.

An Edition with wide Margin for Notes. 7s. 6d.

SELWYN (W.) *Excerpta ex reliquis Versionum, Aquilae, Symmachi, Theodosiani, a Montefalconio aliisque collecta.* GENESIA. Editio GUL. SELWYN, S.T.P., Regie Majestati e Sacris, Dominas Margaretae in Sacra Theologia Lector, Coll. Div. Johann. olim socius. 8vo. 1s.

— *Note Criticæ in Versionem Septuagintaviralem. Exodus, Cap. I.—XXIV.* Curante GUL. SELWYN, S.T.P. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— *Note Criticæ in Versionem Septuagintaviralem. Liber NUMERORUM.* Curante GUL. SELWYN, S.T.P. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

— *Note Criticæ in Versionem Septuagintaviralem. Liber DEUTERONOMII.* Curante GUL. SELWYN, S.T.P. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

— *Origenis Contra Celsum. Liber I.* Curante GUL. SELWYN, S.T.P. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— *Libri I. II. 5s; or interleaved, 7s.*

SELWYN (W.) *Testimonia Patrum in Veteres Interpretes, Septuaginta, Aquilam, Symmachum, Theodotionem, a Montefalconio alisque collecta paucis Additis.* Edidit GUL. SELWYN, S.T.P. 8vo. 6d.

— *Hœre Hebraicæ. Critical and Expository Observations on the Prophecy of Messiah in Isaiah, Chapter IX., and on other Passages of Holy Scripture.* By W. SELWYN, D.D., Lady Margaret's Reader in Theology. *Revised Edition, with Continuation.* 8s.

— *The Creeds of Nicæa; Constantinople; Athanasius; with Extracts and Remarks bearing on the "Warning Clauses" and the "Procession."* By WILLIAM SELWYN, D.D., Canon of Ely Cathedral, Lady Margaret's Reader in Theology, Cambridge. 2s. 6d.

— *Waterloo. A Lay of Jubilee for June 18, A.D. 1815.* By W. SELWYN, D.D. *Second Edition.* 3s.

— *Winfred, afterwards called Boniface. A.D. 680—755.* By W. SELWYN, D.D. Fcp. 4to. 2s.

SEELEY (H. G.) *Index to the Fossil Remains of Aves, Ornithosauria, and Reptilia, from the Secondary System of Strata, arranged in the Woodwardian Museum of the University of Cambridge.* By HARRY GOVIER SEELEY, of St. John's College, Cambridge. With a Prefatory Notice by the Rev. ADAM SEGWICK, LL.D., F.R.S., Woodwardian Professor and Senior Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

— *Ornithosauria, an Elementary Study of the Bones of Pterodactyles, made from Fossil Remains found in the Cambridge Upper Greensand, and Arranged in the Woodwardian Museum of the University of Cambridge.* By HARRY GOVIER SEELEY, of St. John's College, Cambridge. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

SINKER (R.) *The Characteristic Differences between the Books of the New Testament and the immediately preceding Jewish, and the immediately succeeding Christian Literature, considered as an evidence of the Divine Authority of the New Testament.* By R. SINKER, M.A., Librarian of Trinity College, Cambridge. Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— *Testamenta XII Patriarcharum; ad fidem Codicis Cantabrigiensis edita: accedunt Lectiones Cod. Oxoniensis. The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs: an attempt to estimate their Historic and Dogmatic Worth.* By R. SINKER, M.A. Small 8vo. 7s. 6d.

STUDENT'S GUIDE (The) to the University of Cambridge. *New Edition, revised and corrected in accordance with the recent regulations.* Fcap. 8vo. [In the Press.]

SWAINSON (C. A.) *A Plea for Time in Dealing with the Athanasian Creed.* A Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in Anticipation of the Meeting at Lambeth, on Dec. 4, 1872. With Postscripts. By C. A. SWAINSON, D.D., Canon of the Cathedral Church of Chichester, and Norrisian Professor in the University of Cambridge. Small 8vo. 3s.

12 WORKS PUBLISHED BY DEIGHTON, BELL, & CO.

TAYLOR (C.) *The Gospel in the Law. A Critical Examination of the Citations from the Old Testament in the New.* By CHARLES TAYLOR, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College. 8vo. 12s.

TERTULLIANI *Liber Apologeticus. The Apology of Tertullian.* With English Notes and a Preface, intended as an Introduction to the Study of Patristical and Ecclesiastical Latinity. By H. A. WOODHAM, LL.D. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 8s. 6d.

TREVELYAN (G. O.) *The Ladies in Parliament, and other Pieces.* Republished with Additions and Annotations. By G. O. TREVELYAN, late Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge. 6s. 6d.

CONTENTS:—*The Ladies in Parliament—Horace at Athens—The Cambridge Dionysia—The Dawk Bungalow—A Holiday among some Old Friends.*

WHEWELL (Dr.) *Elements of Morality, including Polity.* By W. WHEWELL, D.D., formerly Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. *Fourth Edition,* in 1 vol. 8vo. 15s.

Lectures on the History of Moral Philosophy in England. By the Rev. W. WHEWELL, D.D. *New and Improved Edition, with additional Lectures.* Crown 8vo. 8s.

The Additional Lectures are printed separately in Octavo for the convenience of those who have purchased the former Edition. 3s. 6d.

Astronomy and General Physics considered with reference to Natural Theology (Bridgewater Treatise). By W. WHEWELL, D.D. *New Edition,* small 8vo. (Uniform with the Aldine.) 5s.

Sermons preached in the Chapel of Trinity College, Cambridge. By W. WHEWELL, D.D. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Butler's Three Sermons on Human Nature, and Dissertation on Virtue. Edited by W. WHEWELL, D.D. With a Preface and a Syllabus of the Work. *Fourth and Cheaper Edition.* Cap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

WILLIS (R.) *The Architectural History of Glastonbury Abbey.* By R. WILLIS, M.A., F.R.S., Jacksonian Professor. With Illustrations. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

WILLIAMS (ROWLAND). *Rational Godliness. After the Mind of Christ and the Written Voices of the Church.* By the late ROWLAND WILLIAMS, D.D., Professor of Hebrew at Lampeter. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Paraméswara-jnyána-goshti. A Dialogue of the Knowledge of the Supreme Lord, in which are compared the claims of Christianity and Hinduism, and various questions of Indian Religion and Literature fairly discussed. By the late ROWLAND WILLIAMS, D.D. 8vo. 12s.

CAMBRIDGE: DEIGHTON, BELL, AND CO.

LONDON: GEORGE BELL & SONS.

CAMBRIDGE:—PRINTED BY JONATHAN PALMER

